

THE ROLE OF INFORMAL LEARNING IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF  
TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARDS STUDENTS

RAHŞAN SÖNMEZ

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2016

THE ROLE OF INFORMAL LEARNING IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF  
TEACHER ATTITUDES TOWARDS STUDENTS

Thesis submitted to the  
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts  
in  
Educational Sciences

by  
Raşan Sönmez

Boğaziçi University

2016

## DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, Raḩsan Snmez, certify that

- I am the sole author of this thesis and that I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution;
- this thesis contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other educational institution;
- this is a true copy of the thesis approved by my advisor and thesis committee at BoĒaziçi University, including final revisions required by them.

Signature.....

Date .....30.05.2016.....

## ABSTRACT

### The Role of Informal Learning in the Development of Teacher Attitudes Towards Students

This study explores the development of primary school teachers' attitudes towards students in the informal learning processes. The study aims to understand the influence of certain school components that are considered to be influential in informal learning on the teachers' development of democratic attitudes towards students. The data was collected through semi-structured interviews with 20 primary school teachers who taught at different schools in Kadıköy, Istanbul during the 2013-2014 academic year. The teachers who were interviewed for the study were selected through the 'Democratic Attitude Scale' that was administered to the primary school teachers who taught fourth grade in Kadıköy during the 2012-2013 academic year. 10 teachers who ranked the highest and 10 teachers who ranked the lowest on the scale were selected for interviewing.

Findings suggest that the school administration, colleagues and teachers' classroom experiences with students influence the development of democratic teacher attitudes towards students. When the school administration puts pressure on the teachers or uses reasonable or unacceptable attitudes towards students, this has an effect on teacher attitudes. Likewise, teachers adapt their own attitudes based on the attitudes of their colleagues, which they defined as positive or negative. At times this takes the form of teachers putting the advice of their colleagues into action. Teachers also develop democratic attitudes towards students based on their experiences in the classroom. This is particularly the case for the teachers who scored high on the Democratic Attitude Scale.

## ÖZET

### Öğrencilere Yönelik Öğretmen Tutumlarının Oluşumunda

#### Enformal Öğrenmenin Rolü

Bu çalışma sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrencilere yönelik tutumlarının enformal öğrenme süreçlerinde nasıl geliştiğini incelemektedir. Amaç enformal öğrenmede etkili olduğu düşünülen okul bileşenlerinin öğretmenlerin öğrencilere yönelik demokratik tutumları üzerindeki etkisini anlamaktır. Çalışmanın verileri İstanbul Kadıköy’de sınıf öğretmenliği yapan 20 öğretmenle 2013-2014 Eğitim Öğretim yılında yapılan yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler sonucunda toplanmıştır. Görüşme yapılan öğretmenler, 2012-2013 eğitim öğretim yılında Kadıköy’de görev yapan dördüncü sınıf öğretmenlerine Demokratik Tutum Ölçeği’nin uygulanması sonucunda belirlenmiştir. Ölçekten en yüksek puanı alan 10 öğretmen ve en düşük puanı alan 10 öğretmen görüşme için seçilmiştir.

Araştırma sonuçları, okul yönetiminin, meslektaşların ve sınıfta öğrencilerle yaşanan deneyimlerin öğretmenlerin öğrencilere yönelik demokratik tutum geliştirmesinde etkisini göstermektedir. Okul yönetiminin öğretmenlere baskı uyguladığı durumda ya da öğrencilere yönelik kabul edilebilir ya da kabul edilemez tutumlar sergilemesi öğretmenlerin tutumlarını etkilemektedir. Meslektaşların da öğrencilere yönelik olumlu ya da olumsuz olarak nitelendikleri tutumlarını göz önüne alarak öğretmenler öğrencilerine yönelik tutumlarında değişikliğe gitmektedirler. Kimi zaman bu durum meslektaşlardan alınan doğrudan tavsiyelerin uygulanması şeklinde gerçekleşmektedir. Öğretmenler sınıfta yaşadıkları deneyimlerle öğrencilere yönelik demokratik tutumlarını geliştirme yoluna gitmektedir. Özellikle demokratik tutum ölçeğinde yüksek puan alan öğretmenler açısından bu durum geçerlidir.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank Prof. Fatma Gök and Prof. Rıfat Okçabol for their invaluable contributions. We shared many things with my dearest thesis consultant Assistant Professor Ayşe Caner during our long journey. I am very much indebted to her, for she always makes one reach the answer with the right question. I would like to thank and show my gratitude to her for the patience and courage and her wisdom that always made me achieve better. I would like to thank Associate Professor Özlem Ünlühisarcıklı for always sharing my thesis excitement and being part of this experience. I would also like to thank Assistant Professor Cem Kirazoğlu for his support, sincerity and effort he showed as part of this process.

I would like to thank my dear friend Ulaş Karakoç for always being there for me from the initial steps to the current conclusion of my academic life that led to this thesis. I would like to thank dear Özlem Yazlık for her editorial support. I believe that it would be a chance for everyone to meet a friend like Özlem. I would like to thank my dear hardworking and sensitive sister Ayşe Sönmez, who stood beside me whenever I needed her support. I would like to thank dear Onur Seçkin for the horizons he showed to me. Along with Onur, who did not spare his companionship and support, Gökçe Güvercin always supported me as well. My bosom friend Evrim Kaya, with whom I have shared unique times, did not spare her support to my academic life even through her toughest times. I would like to thank Seyfi Berk and Elif Altundaş for their supportive attitudes. Finally, I would like to thank dearest Onur Yılmaz, who made his best in shaping the thesis, was near me at all stages and created solutions whenever I was challenged...

For Nehir and all little sunshines in the world...

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Research question .....	3
1.2 Significance of the study.....	3
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	5
2.1 Informal learning .....	5
2.2 Informal workplace learning.....	10
2.3 Informal workplace learning of teachers .....	12
2.4 Teacher attitudes .....	18
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .....	29
3.1 Research design .....	29
3.2 Sample .....	30
3.3 Democratic attitude scale.....	32
3.4 Data collection .....	36
3.5 Data collection instrument.....	37
3.6 Data analysis .....	39
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS.....	40
4.1 Interaction with school administration .....	40
4.2 Interaction with colleagues .....	43
4.3 Interaction with students.....	47
4.4 Interaction with parents .....	51
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION.....	55
5.1 The effects of interactions with school administration on teachers' attitudes .....	55
5.2 The effects of interactions with colleagues on teachers' attitudes.....	58
5.3 The effects of interactions with students on teachers' attitudes .....	60
5.4 The effects of interactions with students' parents on teachers' attitudes .....	63
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION AND FINAL REMARKS.....	66
6.1 Limitations of the study .....	67
6.2 Recommendations for further research.....	68
APPENDIX A: MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION APPROVAL .....	69
APPENDIX B: BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY HUMAN RESEARCH INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL .....	70
APPENDIX C: PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM (TURKISH).....	71
APPENDIX D: PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM (ENGLISH).....	72
APPENDIX E: DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDE SCALE (TURKISH).....	73
APPENDIX F: DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDE SCALE (ENGLISH).....	76

APPENDIX G: SAMPLE SELECTION LIST .....	80
APPENDIX H: PROFILE OF HIGH POINT'S PARTICIPANTS INITIALLY SELECTED.....	83
APPENDIX I: PROFILE OF LOW POINT'S PARTICIPANTS INITIALLY SELECTED.....	84
APPENDIX J: INTERVIEW FORMS (TURKISH).....	85
APPENDIX K: INTERVIEW FORMS (ENGLISH) .....	87
APPENDIX L: PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM (TURKISH).....	89
APPENDIX M: PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM (ENGLISH).....	90
APPENDIX N: NARRATIVES IN TURKISH .....	91
REFERENCES.....	98

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Effective Classroom.....	22
Table 2. Democratic Classroom.....	23
Table 3. Final List of Interviewees .....	35
Table 4. Gender of Sample .....	36
Table 5. Mean Age and Mean Teaching Experience of Sample .....	36
Table 6. Sample Selection List .....	80
Table 7. Characteristics of High Point's Participants Initially Selected.....	83
Table 8.Characteristics of Low Point's Participants Initially Selected .....	84

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Informal learning has been one of the key concepts in the literature on the learning practices. When the concept of “informal learning” is used in the workplace context, it is usually perceived in relation with the role of the “workplace learning” in increasing the job quality and performance (Garrick, 1998; Colley et al., 2003; Straka, 2004; Hodkinson&Hodkinson, 2005; Jurasaitė-Harbison, 2009). Consequently, “informal workplace learning” often refers to the embedded character of the learning of individual at work.

The research that examines teachers’ informal learning at work has increased in the last twenty years. Although the learning process of teachers at school is mostly associated with in-service teacher training, there is evidence that the formal in-service training experiences influence the teachers partially (Jurasaitė-Harbison & Rex, 2010). A number of studies look into how teachers learn informally in the work processes (Hodkinson&Hodkinson, 2005; Hoekstra et al., 2009; Meirink et al., 2009; Jurasaitė-Harbison&Rex, 2010). These studies consider various dimensions of the relationship between informal learning, the improvement of the learning process and the change in teaching quality.

Informal learning is to be understood as learning from experience that does not necessarily happen during formal learning interactions in the workplace but also includes learning during daily activities at work, home or anywhere else (Eraut, 2004; Straka, 2004). According to Eraut (2004), informal learning interactions are characterized by “implicit, unintended, opportunistic and unstructured learning and the absence of a teacher” (p.250).

The concepts that are often associated with teachers' informal learning in school settings are "individual teacher learning", "the school as a context for learning" and "workplace learning" (Hoekstra et al., 2009, p. 277). The research on teachers' informal workplace learning focuses on how teachers learn informally in school settings, providing examples of their learning through interactions with their colleagues and students that are not pre-planned (Lohman, 2000; Hodkinson&Hodkinson, 2005; Hoekstra et al., 2009). Eraut (2004) maintains that the workplace context provides new opportunities to understand learning "because it encompasses a wide range of more or less structured environments, which are only rarely structured with learning mind." (p.247). The workplace interactions of teachers include their interactions with their students and the attitude they adopt in these interactions. In the hierarchical organizational structure of the school, students consider adults in the school as "the source of authority" (p. 105), providing them with due power and responsibility (Yariv, 2010). According to Pellegrino (2010), the authority attributed to the teachers by the students is a main characteristic of the teacher-student relationship since this relationship is not between peers but between teachers as responsible adults and their students. Teachers' attitudes in their interactions with their students can be placed on the different ends of the democratic continuum, identified by higher and lower degrees of democratic attitudes.

According to Pepper and Henry (1985), democratic teacher attitudes are constituted by "mutual respect", "shared responsibility" and "shared decision-making" between teachers and students (p.265). For Basu and Barton (2010), "the shared authority" is another significant characteristic of democratic teaching interactions (p.83).

Considering the relationship between teachers' informal learning practices and their attitudes towards their students, one important question that emerges is how teachers develop democratic attitudes towards students through their informal learning experiences at school. The aim of this study is to analyze the role of teachers' informal learning experiences at schools in the development of attitudes towards their students that can be placed on the different ends of the democratic attitude continuum, identified by higher and lower degrees of democratic attitudes.

### 1.1 Research question

The overall research question of this study is:

What is the role of informal learning in the development of teacher attitudes towards students in Turkey? And what are the factors that contribute to it?

Within this overall research question, the study explores the following more specific question:

What are the factors in informal workplace learning of teachers that influence the development democratic teacher attitudes towards students?

### 1.2 Significance of the study

This study contributes to the literature by exploring, first, the role of informal learning in the development of teacher attitudes towards students in Istanbul. It also sheds light on how democratic teacher attitudes emerge in association with informal learning practices, on which very little known. Eventhough, the studies on informal learning has increased considerably within the last two decades, none of these studies focus on how exactly the workplace learning influences teachers' attitudes towards students. The role of informal workplace learning in the development of democratic teacher attitudes towards students has not been previously studied in Turkey. The findings and insights of the study may help teacher practitioners and trainers better

understand how informal learning at schools influences teacher attitudes. These findings and insights have the potential to contribute to the formation of more democratic attitudes among teachers by identifying the relations, practices and contexts in school settings that facilitate the development of attitudes that can be characterized by a higher degree of democratic attributes.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter first presents the existing literature on the definitions of informal learning, the evolution of informal learning in the field of educational studies and main concepts that are used in the discussions on informal learning. The chapter then discusses informal learning in the workplace in general and in schools specifically for teachers. This is followed by the discussion of studies of school contexts and teacher attitudes. Finally, the studies on democratic teacher attitudes are presented.

#### 2.1 Informal learning

Informal learning is a term that appears in the literature quite often. Eraut et al. (2000) defines informal learning “as learning that comes closer to the informal end than the formal end of a continuum” (p.250). Eraut (2004) classifies informal learning as “implicit learning”, “reactive learning” and “deliberative learning” (p. 250). According to Eraut’s classification, the subject learns accidentally and does not know what is learned during implicit learning. Reactive learning happens during the time of action and it is voluntarily. Deliberative learning, on the other hand, has a more particular aim and time such as “discussion and review of past actions, communications, events, experiences”, and “engagement in decision making, problem solving, and planned informal learning” (Eraut, 2004, p.250). Eraut (2004) also states that informal learning has provided a new perspective in adult learning by pointing to its adjustable, collective and personal characteristics. In Eraut’s conceptualization of informal learning, the focus is placed on the interaction of the social and the individual since informal learning is considered to take into account

both “the social significance of learning from other people” and “individual agency” in interpreting this learning (2004, p.247).

Informal learning has various definitions in the literature. Marsick and Watkins (1990) emphasize incidental dimension by defining informal and incidental learning as “learning outside of formally structured, institutionally sponsored, classroom-based activities” (p. 6-7). They point out that in such non-routine settings, informal and incidental learning occurs because people do not consider themselves obliged to act according to the practices and procedures they normally use in formally structured activities. According to Marsick and Watkins (1990) such learning can be implicit or unconscious which can later lead people to re-examine the learning situation and their interpretations of it.

Similarly, Livingstone (2001) defines informal learning as “any activity involving the pursuit of understanding, knowledge or skill which occurs without the presence of externally imposed curricular criteria” (p. 4). According to Livingstone, informal learning can take place in any setting that is outside of the pre-determined curricula of educational settings and can be undertaken by groups or individuals. Likewise, Straka’s definition of informal learning (2004), points out that it is not framed with learning objectives, learning processes or intentional learning support. Furthermore, Straka (2004) specifies different contexts where informal learning takes place, defining it as “learning resulting from daily life activities related to work, family, or leisure” (p. 9).

The concept of informal learning in the literature has evolved throughout the history of educational studies. According to Colley et al. (2003), there are five phases of informal learning. They note that the term ‘non-formal’ was used first time in a

UNESCO<sup>1</sup> report in 1947. They classify the phases as years: 1947-1958, the 1970s, the 1980s, the 1990s, and lastly the turn of the millennium. Colley et al. (2003) state as “the first wave of efforts to develop non-formal education were underpinned by ‘modernization’ theories, resting on a social-democratic, reformist ideology and Keynesian<sup>[2]</sup> economic principles” (p. 10).

Colley et al. (2003) identify two aims for the first wave of non-formal education initiatives, which include increasing economic profits in the countries of the North and increasing democratization in the world. They emphasize that the first wave perceived the Southern populations as lacking knowledge and skills and considered the rural lifestyle of Southern populations as a hindrance to social and economic development. Regarding the first wave of non-formal education as characterized by the modernization theory, Colley et al. (2003) assert that modernization theory failed to provide harmony and more equal relations between the North and the South.

According to Colley et al. (2003), in the second phase in the 1970s, non-formal education turned into non-formal learning. They consider this development as a response to the failure of the theory of modernization and pro-capitalist and pro-Northern regimes associated with it. Colley et al. (2003) note that the second phase of informal learning is characterized by radical social-democratic models such as Freire’s radical learning movement<sup>3</sup>. Straka (2004, p.4) identifies two significant aspects of the second phase which includes (1) the radical social democratic

---

<sup>1</sup>UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. It was founded on 16 November 1945. UNESCO has 195 members and 8 Associate Members.

<sup>2</sup>“Keynes further asserted that free markets have no self-balancing mechanisms that lead to full employment. Keynesian economists justify government intervention through public policies that aim to achieve full employment and price stability.” (Jahan, S. et al., 2014, p. 53)

<sup>3</sup>“Freire’s philosophy thoroughly informs peace education pedagogy and practice. His complicated concept of conscientization provides the foundation of peace education’s hope for a link between education and social transformation. His insistence on dialogue and his discussions of egalitarian teacher-student relations provide the basis for peace education pedagogy.” (Bartlett, 2008, p. 5)

approaches of non-formal education that started in the South and gained popularity in the North through social movements such as feminism, anti-racism and the working class movement and (2) socio-cultural theories of learning that considered non-formal and informal learning as emancipatory because learners are considered as having an increased control over their own learning outside of formal educative settings.

Colley et al. (2003) state that in the 1980s, economic policies turned to free-market economics, and as a result of this economic policy shift mass unemployment took place in the countries of the North, the learning opportunities were privatized and traditional forms of apprenticeship ended, resulting in the formalization of previously non-formal ways of learning skills.

Colley et al. (2003) identify the fourth phase in the 1990s as a postmodern space for non-formal learning. They note that feminism, environmentalism, ethno-culturalism and similar movements have gained popularity. Finally, the last phase identified by Colley et al. (2003) is the turn of the millennium. They identified non-formal learning and participatory approaches as key themes in this phase as “research and practitioner interest in ‘non-formal learning’ as a category may, in some cases at least, reflect dissatisfaction with the separation of formal and informal categories for learning, and a desire to grasp their actual interpretation” (p.13).

In relation to the fifth phase of non-formal learning, Straka (2004, p.5) point to the connection between non-formal and lifelong learning, which was promoted at the European level in the millennium. Straka maintains that the object of the European policies is to promote informal and non-formal learning and also to check their consequences. According to him, the European Commission’s policy target two main issues: “the need for increased social cohesion and engagement and the need to

improve economic competitiveness by increasing skills and employability of workers through better education and training.”(Straka, 2004, p.5). He concludes that the European Commission’s non-formal and informal learning policies and objectives overwhelmingly concern the workplace.

The abovementioned discussion on the phases of informal learning in the history of educational studies shows the evolution of the concept from non-formal education into informal learning and the social and economic objectives associated with it. Recent discussions in informal learning studies do not only focus on the abovementioned socio-economic goals but also on the external and social aspects of learning. These studies identify the social aspect of individual learning as a key element of informal learning (Eraut, 2004; Straka, 2004; Hodkinson et al., 2008). Eraut (2004) takes into account the social aspect of learning when he classifies informal learning as “learning from others” (p. 254) and “learning from experience” (p. 247). Hodkinson et al. (2008) note that it is crucial to recognize how social practices influence learning and one needs to understand the dynamics of the learning culture. Hodkinson et al. (2008)state that “a cultural theory of learning has to address the ways in which an individual learner learns through participation in many different situations, both simultaneously and successively” (p. 40).

Similarly, Straka’s learning concept consists of external and internal conditions (2004). Straka identifies external conditions as other persons such as superiors, colleagues, tasks, requirements, technical equipment, teaching objectives, organizational objectives and social norms. Internal conditions for Straka are knowledge, skills, abilities, motivations, emotions and dispositions. In line with Hodkinson et al. (2008), Straka points to the intrinsic link between external conditions and social and cultural aspects.

This section has introduced different definitions of informal learning and presented the evolution of the concept in the field of education and recent studies that point to the interaction between social and individual aspects in informal learning.

Next is the discussion of studies that explore informal learning at the workplace.

## 2.2 Informal workplace learning

The workplace context has been an integral part of informal learning. The studies on informal learning at the workplace seem to focus on the social and cultural aspects of informal learning and the role of daily experiences and spontaneous interactions in informal learning (Billett, 2001; Jurasaitė-Harbison, 2009; Hoekstra et al., 2009).

Billett (2001) considers learning in working life as a result of daily thinking and performing determined by the work practices of participants. Jurasaitė-Harbison (2009) identifies workplace learning as “a cultural practice that is deeply imbedded in everyday professional practice” (p.301). Ellström (2001) points to the relation of individual learning to organizational learning whereby changes in organizational practices such as procedures and structures take place through individual learning.

Hoekstra et al. (2009) points to the unstructured and spontaneous aspects of informal learning at the workplace, which would defy the application of standards to learning. Similarly, Eraut (2004) notes that informal learning at work “brings new perspectives to research on learning because it encompasses a wide range of more or less structured environments, which are only rarely structured with learning in mind” (p. 247).

Because workplace learning processes are complex, it is useful to identify the main elements in these processes. Billett (2001) classifies factors that influence how and what individuals learn in workplace as follows:

These qualities comprise: (i) the types of activities individuals engage in (i.e. routine-non-routine); (ii) the direct and indirect guidance (proximal-distal) accessible in the practice; (iii) access to and standing in the community of work practice (peripheral to fuller participation); (iv) duration of participation; and (v) how the activities relate to individuals' existing knowledge base (including their interest). (p. 20)

Billett (2001) discusses not only the individual learning at the workplace but also the choices that the individual makes in this process. Although the employers and administrators may provide an environment that would create opportunities for informal learning, there is a degree to which individuals choose to join these work practices. Thus Billett (2001) emphasizes that “there is an interdependence between the social practice and the individual acting in that social practice” (p.20). Likewise, Eraut (2004) points to the social aspect in informal workplace learning and identifies two factors influencing learning at work: “the organization and allocation of work” and “relationships and the social climate of the workplace” (p.270).

Similarly, Hodkinson and Hodkinson (2005) explore the relationship between workplace practices and the individual's involvement in these practices. They note that each workplace has different practices that would influence informal workplace learning differently and each employee has different interpretations of and attitudes towards these practices. In relation to the effects of workplace practices on the job-related practices of employees, Billett (2002) states that the workplace may provide opportunities for workers to improve their job-related practices by involving them in significant vocational practices and decisions.

There are several studies on workplace learning for professionals including newly appointed managers (Eraut, 2004), nurses, graduate engineers, trainee-chartered accountants (Eraut, 2007), process operators in an aluminum plant, shop workers in a retail store, programmers in an advanced IT consultancy firm, tax

officers in a municipal tax office (Skule, 2004), bank workers (van Woerkom et al. 2002) and newly qualified or experienced teachers (Williams, 2003; Hoekstra et al., 2009). After the above discussion of the main aspects of informal workplace learning, the next section will present the studies on informal workplace learning of teachers.

### 2.3 Informal workplace learning of teachers

Since the importance of the workplace learning has been recognized, the informal workplace learning has been the focus of in-depth studies in the educational literature. Teachers' workplace learning is one of the major issues in the educational literature. In particular, informal aspects of teachers' learning received attention by educational and workplace researchers (Hodkinson et al., 2008; Hoekstra et al., 2009; Meirink et al., 2009; McNally & Reid, 2009). Similar to the studies in informal workplace learning discussed in the previous section, Hodkinson et al. (2008) and McNally and Reid (2009) point to the interaction between the social and the individual in informal workplace learning of teachers. Hodkinson et al. (2008) note that we need to understand how the past, e.g. life history and previous experiences, powerfully influence current learning. McNally and Reid (2009) emphasize the social environment in the schools and call attention to the wide range of work relationships in the school.

As for the in-depth studies that look into workplace learning of teachers, Hoekstra et al. (2009) aim to explore how perceptions of the teachers have on the conditions of the workplace for learning are connected with their informal workplace learning actions and results. They examine the context of the reform that was introduced in the Netherlands. Their sample consists of two upper grade institutions

of secondary education and two teachers from each school, one reform oriented and one no reform-oriented teacher.

Hoekstra et al. (2009) classify the learning activities of these four teachers into four major category: “Learning by experimenting, learning by considering own teaching practice, learning by getting ideas from others” and finally “learning by doing” (p.278). They also identify five recurring conditions in teachers’ informal workplace learning as “Teacher autonomy, teacher collaboration, reflective dialogue, receiving feedback, experience of shared norms and responsibility within the school” (p. 280)

Hoekstra et al. (2009) conclude that the conditions for informal workplace learning for teachers are shaped both by the conditions and resources in the school and teachers’ own agency in interpreting their work and benefitting from the existing conditions. Pointing to the relationship between the workplace conditions for informal learning and teachers’ interpretations of them, this study points to the significance of the role of workplace conditions, practices and interactions in teachers’ informal workplace learning.

Another study that explores informal learning of teachers at schools looks into how teachers’ informal learning is shaped by their interactions with their colleagues (Meirink et al., 2009). This study has a sample of thirty-four experienced teachers who participate in the study in five groups. The study uses pre-post questionnaires and a digital log filled in six times during the school year that asks the teachers to evaluate situations that they could encounter in the school. The categories of the questionnaire are derived from the literature and identified as “doing, experimenting, reflecting, learning from others without interaction, learning from others with interaction” (Meirink et al., 2009, p.210). The findings from both

instruments suggest that participants learn from their individual consideration and interaction with colleagues during challenging positions. The results of the questionnaire reveal that teachers feel supported to discuss issues related with their work with their colleagues. However, the results of the digital log show that participants learn from observation and listening to their colleagues during problematic situations (Meirink et al., 2009). The findings of this study are useful in identifying different methods such as reflection, consulting colleagues about work-related issues, observing and listening to colleague that teachers use in informal learning at school.

Another significant study that explores informal workplace learning of teachers focuses on first year teachers in England. Williams (2003) examines the informal characteristics of the new teachers' learning. She explains that all new teachers have to complete an induction year according to the law in to get their qualified teacher status in England. The first year requirements for professional developments consists of the processes that are "reduction of teaching load", "regular meetings with a named induction tutor", "an individualized program of support and monitoring", "half-termly observations of their teaching", "a termly assessment meeting", and "a job description in which the demands are 'reasonable'" (Williams, 2003, p.208). Based on an analysis of interviews with the new teachers, tutors, and school heads, the study finds that first year teachers learn through "implicit", "reactive", and "deliberative" learning. The study identifies reactive learning as a key category for first year of teachers' because it is spontaneous and unplanned, arising from the collaborative activities at the schools:

Structural collaboration referred to collaborative activity arising from organizational procedures either related directly to the requirements of the new mandatory arrangements, or to conscious school-level decisions

about ways of working... More significant was the nature of this collaboration, with its emphasis upon the informal, the unplanned and the opportunist providing further support for the recognition of the non-formal in the first year of teaching. (Williams, 2003, p.214)

Hodkinson and Hodkinson (2005) also examine the workplace learning in English schools, focusing on secondary school teachers. The study consist of case studies in two English secondary schools conducted between 2000 and 2003. The authors classify teachers' learning as "individual" such as "actions, reactions, interactions and activities in the classroom, and in anticipation of approaching situations" (p.115). They also note that learning has a "collaborative" character such as "conservation and discussion, observing and taking an interest in what others do, and joint activity" (p.116). The study shows that "individual learning" and "collaborative learning" have informal characteristics and are both adopted in teachers' informal workplace learning.

Studies into teachers' informal workplace learning have been conducted in Northern American settings as well. Collinson and Cook's (2003) study looks into the interaction between personal and organizational learning and the school background in the US American context. Their study is carried out in three middle schools that need to increase their academic performance according to state rules that volunteer to participate in the project. In each school, 10 teachers participate in the study, which uses a pre-interview survey, a semi-structured interview, and a post-interview survey. The findings show that that participants consider factors such as equality, mutuality, subjective motivation, and reciprocal learning from each other significant in their workplace learning.

Another study aiming to understand teachers' workplace professional learning in the US context was carried out by Jurasaitė-Harbison (2009). Data in this

study is gathered at three different schools Lithuania and the USA. The researcher carries out observations to understand how the research participants engage in social interactions in school. The study compares the quality of the Lithuania and USA schools with each other because of its effects on teachers' learning. In addition these, semi-structured interviews and reflective journals from the participants are used in the study. The findings suggest that informal learning opportunities at all schools are influenced by administration, professional relationships, and the teachers' individual positions. The role of leadership in teachers' informal learning is elaborated upon as an important factor in this study as

Administrative arrangements in the schools reflected contrasting leadership approaches and, thus, provided different opportunities for teachers' professional growth ranging from close supervision and judgment (the Russian school), to accommodating teachers' professional needs (the US school), to empowering teachers to take responsibility for their work quality and professional growth (the Lithuanian school). (2009, p.318)

Another study from a Northern American setting that looked into different factors in informal learning of teachers is Smaller's (2005) study on the Canadian Teacher Learning Research Project which aims to explore the way teachers at elementary and secondary schools in Canada understand themselves and each other as informal learners. The research used a national survey, teachers' weekly diaries and a limited number of in-depth interviews between 1998 and 2001. The findings show that 60 % of the respondents of the survey think that informal learning come true with "teamwork/communication skills, teaching a particular grade/subject, classroom management, student problems, and keeping up with new teaching-related knowledge" (2005, p.8). Based on the analysis of teacher diaries, Smaller (2005) states that informal learning of teachers takes place not only in school settings but also in home settings. Based on the result of the study the most significant source of

learning is the interaction with colleagues. This comprehensive study provides significant findings about how teachers learn informally about their work both in school and everyday life settings.

Different from the Canadian study discussed above, Lohman (2003) only focuses on work situations to understand which situations improve the participation of public school teachers in informal. The study used interviews and site visits to 22 public school teachers for data collection. The study shows that “new teaching tasks” (p.46), “new leadership roles” (p.48) as mentoring teachers or serving on school and district-wide committees, and “adherence to policies and procedures” (p.49) aroused engagement in informal learning. Other work situations that triggered teachers’ participation in informal learning are listed as referring to new textbooks and professional literature and correspondence with teachers at other schools. The study notes that some personal characteristics such as “initiative, self-efficacy, commitment to life-long learning, and interest in their content area” play a role in teachers’ informal learning” (Lohman, 2003, p.50).

As the discussion of the studies into teachers’ informal workplace learning suggest, there are external and internal conditions that effect teachers’ informal learning in the workplace. Colleagues in the workplace emerge as important external learning sources for teachers (Smaller, 2005; Hoekstra et al., 2009; Meirink et al., 2009). This is followed by the school leadership, school context, regulatory frameworks at the school, national policy level (Hodkinson and Hodkinson, 2005; Jurasaitė-Harbison, 2009) and the interaction with students (Smaller, 2005) which are among significant external sources for teachers’ informal workplace learning. The internal sources that are influential in teachers’ informal workplace learning can be summarized as their subjective motivation (Collinson & Cook, 2003), teachers’

own stances on the policies and informal learning (Jurasaitė & Harbison, 2009), teachers' communication skills and attempts to communicate with colleagues and keep up with new developments in their subject area (Smaller, 2005) and teachers' own interest in the subject area and lifelong learning (Lohman, 2003).

After the discussion of studies that looked into different external and internal factors in teachers' informal workplace learning, the next section will present studies on teachers' attitudes towards students. The aim of this study is to explore the role of informal workplace learning in teachers' attitudes towards students and the relationship between this learning and the degree of democratic teacher attitudes. Thus the next section will first discuss teacher attitudes to students in general and then focus on democratic teacher attitudes towards students.

#### 2.4 Teacher attitudes

Attitude is defined by İnceoğlu (2010) as an emotional and behavioral reaction of an individual to a social issue or an event based on his/her experience, knowledge, emotion and impetus. This definition implies that teacher attitudes emerge during the teaching experience. According to Adalsteinsdóttir (2004), teacher perceptions, behaviors and practices are important classroom factors that affect the learning environment. The attitudes of teachers towards students can be classified under a range of subgroups such as democratic, authoritarian, traditional and modern, but this study will focus on the democratic attitudes of teachers towards their students.

Relationships between teachers and students in the classroom are managed with rules and procedures called "classroom management". According to Jones and Jones (2013), classroom management involves everything that the teachers are required to do to encourage student participation and cooperation in the classroom activities.

They emphasize that except the notion of student discipline, classroom management

includes all the things that teachers must do to foster student involvement and cooperation in classroom activities. According to Jones and Jones (2013), effective classroom management includes factors such as:

Creating classroom environments in which all students feel safe and valued... inexorably connected to effective instruction... methods that enhance students' sense of ownership, responsibility, and personal efficacy... methods that help students develop new behavioral skills... requiring teachers to thoughtfully consider their goals for students as well as their own values and beliefs about working with students... thoughtful planning and focused professional growth... collaboration between educators with different roles within the school. (pp.5-6)

Additionally, Allen (2010) claims that effective teaching entails more than controlling student's behavior. He emphasizes that teachers should establish supporting learning environments, a constructive learning community and forceful and effective teaching strategies. Similarly, Ratcliff et al. (2010) note that teachers interact with their students not only instructionally but also socially. They point to the complex structure of classrooms and note that the leadership abilities of teachers extensively affect the quality of interactions in the classroom such as those between teachers and students and among the students themselves. Hayes et al. (2007) points to teachers' language and verbal expressions as a key factor to reach positive outcomes in the classroom.

The abovementioned studies on classroom management focus on the ways through which teachers can establish supportive learning environments that help students feel valued and enhance their participation in the rules and procedures that influence their learning and well-being. There are a number of studies on classroom management that tackle the question of how such supportive and participatory classrooms can be created in the hierarchical organizational structures of schools.

Yariv (2009) points out that students recognize the school as a hierarchical

organization and the adults as “the source of authority” and children must accept adults’ rules, and state that “Teachers’ authority has its own boundaries- it is governed by legislation, governmental rules, schools’ norms and also by the boundaries their principal, colleagues and pupils set for them.” (p.95)

Pace and Hemmings (2007) also considers authority as a necessary factor since it is formed by interactions between teachers and students. Pace and Hemmings (2007) identify three types of authority as “traditional”, “charismatic”, and “legal-rational authority” (p.6) based on Weber and Durkheim. Traditional authority is related to “the ruling position” (p.6). People who are accepted as an authority figure transfer traditions through their directions and adherence. Charismatic authority occurs when individuals can influence their environment intensely and gain uncommonly high prestige. For example, charismatic teachers influence students with their desire to teach and engage the students in the teaching-learning activity. The legitimacy of charismatic teachers is determined by whether their ability satisfies student expectations or not. Legal-rational authority is also named bureaucratic authority. It is determined by rules and policies that are based on rational values. Bureaucratic teachers can be seen as enacting “the role of a boss in the workplace of the classroom” (p.6).

Pellegrino (2010) notes that teacher authority is a significant part of teacher and student relationships and should not be considered as preventing respect and friendly interactions between students and teachers:

Authority may relate to the relationship between the teacher and students in terms of obedience to classroom rules and behavioral expectations. It does not preclude a friendly relationship between teachers and students. In fact, effective classroom authority necessitates a friendly and mutually respectful relationship. (p. 65)

Likewise, Tirri and Puolimatka (2000) discuss the issue of teacher authority in relation to teacher and student relation and identify two kinds of teacher authority that are “deontic” as committing rules and “epistemic” as learned in the field (p.159). They note that deontic authority is necessary to manage the classroom. On the other hand, they consider epistemic authority as subject matter knowledge and pedagogical awareness. Tirri and Puolimatka note that these two types of authority are related closely related with each other. In relation to teacher authority and its role in teacher and student relations, Yariv (2009) looks into how children perceive teachers’ authority and its limits and explores what conditions lead to student disobedience. The study is based on a sample of 210 elementary, middle and high school students in Israel. Yariv (2009) notes that students identify teachers’ unacceptable demands:

Intervention in personal matters such as forcing children to discuss personal, intimate matters... violation of civil rights such as freedom and dignity such as physical violence and discriminating between students... putting the student in a moral dilemma such as asking the child to do things that are immoral or in conflict with other authorities’ rules and interests... making demands which are beyond the student’s ability such as asking about topics which were not taught... violating the school norms such as ordering them to clean up the school in place of the cleaning workers. (pp. 100-101)

Almost all students in the study conducted by Yariv (2009) agree that they must follow their teacher’s instructions. Students identify four reasons to follow their teachers as “avoiding punishment, minimizing disturbance to the lesson, showing respect to the teachers as adults, and appreciating their role as guardians and educators who contribute to their own development and well-being” (p.105). In light of the above discussion of teacher and student relations in the context of classroom management and perceptions of teachers’ authority, it is important to explore what makes a classroom democratic. Pepper and Henry (1985) list the democratic principles and values in the classroom in the following way: “mutual respect”,

“shared responsibility”, and “shared decision-making” (p.265). They state that students can work together with their teachers for “planning, organizing, implementing, and participating in the business of teaching, learning, thinking, and living harmoniously in the classroom” (p.265).

Pepper and Henry (1985) emphasize cooperative activity and the importance of creating conditions to improve students’ behaviors:

In a democratic setting, cooperative activity revolves around the processes of shared responsibility and shared decision making. In a democratic classroom, such processes are essential as they afford students the opportunity to develop characteristics that will promote self-disciplined behaviors. (pp. 265-266)

Likewise, Basu and Barton (2010) maintain that an important part of democratic teaching is “the shared authority” (p.83). Their study elaborates on democratic pedagogy in science classes, with the aim of creating democratic pedagogical relations in the classrooms. The study was carried out with 6 teachers and 21 students from 6th to 12th grades. This study found that three themes emerged from students’ opinions about democracy as “freedom and choice”, “community and caring”, and “the importance of being exceptional or of taking leadership” (2010, pp. 78-79).

Following what is discussed above, effective and democratic qualities of classrooms could be arranged as in Table 1 and Table 2:

Table 1. Effective Classroom

Quality of Effective Classrooms	<p>* “Methods should enhance students’ sense of ownership, responsibility, and personal efficacy” (Jones and Jones, 2013, p.5)</p> <p>* “Positive learning environment” (Allen, 2010, p.7)</p>
---------------------------------	--

Table 2. Democratic Classroom

<p>Student opinions about democracy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* “Freedom of speech, freedom to have what you want to have”</li> <li>* “Building a community people working together to try and build a community”</li> <li>* “Standing up for what you believe in, taking leadership in what you do” (Basu and Barton, 2010, pp. 78-79)</li> </ul>
<p>Qualities of democratic classrooms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* “mutual respect, shared responsibility, shared decision making”</li> <li>* “student and teachers working together, planning, organizing, implementing”</li> <li>* “students participating in the business of teaching in the learning, thinking, and living harmoniously” (Pepper and Henry, 1985, p.265)</li> </ul>

Although there is no research about how teachers develop democratic attitudes towards students in the informal workplace learning processes, there are studies on the democratic attitudes of teachers in Turkish settings.

In one of the study’s, Yalçın (2007) explored democratic attitudes and behaviors of high school teachers during class management based on the views of high school students and teachers in the 2005-2006 academic year. The study adapted the Democratic Classroom Management Scale and administered it to 120 high school teachers and 175 high school students for validity. Then, the data was quantitatively gathered from 227 high school teachers and 953 high school students in Malatya. The study shows that although teachers think that their attitudes and behaviors are democratic, students strongly disagree. According to the findings, teachers think that they show democratic attitudes towards students such as allowing students to talk freely in the lesson, listening to the students, and trying to understand

them. However, findings suggest that students think that teachers do not have sufficiently democratic attitudes. For example, findings show that students could not criticize their teachers and some teachers showed dictatorial and humiliating attitudes towards students.

Çakmur's (2007) study looked into the relationship between the degrees of teachers' democratic behaviors and demographic and background characteristics of teachers. The survey in this study was administered to 400 teachers at nine schools in five districts of Istanbul. The study shows that there is no relationship between the gender of the teacher, the type of school the teacher graduated from and the degree of democratic behavior exhibited by the teacher in the classroom. However, the study found that the teachers who have taken in-service training about democratic values have more democratic attitudes than others. Thus, it is suggested that in-service training about democratic education positively influences teachers' attitudes towards students in classroom settings.

Similarly, Kaya (2013) attempted to understand the relationship between teachers' democratic attitudes towards classroom management and such qualities as gender, age, marital status, degree of teaching experience, school type, class, educational level and in-service trainings attended about democratic classroom management. The scale was administered to 268 public and private primary school teachers in Erzurum. The study is found that female teachers and those who received in-service training about democratic classroom management have a higher degree of democratic attitudes towards students. Also, those teachers who have more than 21 years of teaching experience seem to have more democratic attitudes than others.

Likewise, Üstün's study (2011) found that female teachers have more democratic attitudes than male teachers, with a study of 336 teachers from 26 public and private schools in different districts of Istanbul. In this study, Reflective Thinking Tendency Scale and Classroom Environment Related Democratic Attitude Scale were used. The study defines reflective thinking defined as thinking effectively, consistently, and carefully about any belief or information and information structure supporting the conclusions that are aimed to reach. The study found that there is a positive relationship between reflective thinking tendency and democratic attitudes of teachers. Apart from gender, no other variables including age and seniority were found to be significantly related to democratic teacher attitudes. Another study about teacher democratic attitudes was conducted by Telatar (2012). The study looked into the correlation between democratic attitudes and personal characteristics of teachers in the elementary schools. The sample was 190 class and subject matter teachers in such districts of Istanbul as Sultanbeyli, Kartal, and Maltepe. Democratic Attitudes Scale and the revised version of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire were employed for data collection. The study concluded that gender, age, and seniority, and personality are not significant determinants of democratic attitudes of teachers. Personality in this study was evaluated at the three sub-levels as extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism according to the revised version of Eysenck Personality Questionnaire and teachers' personality was not found to be to be positively correlated with democratic attitudes. Also, the study found no correlation between democratic attitudes and teachers' characteristics such as seniority in the profession, age, gender and their subject matter.

To sum up the studies on demographic teacher attitudes in Turkey, both Çakmur (2007) Kaya (2013) found that teachers who received in-service training

have more democratic attitudes towards students. In Üstün (2011) and Kaya (2013), gender emerged to be a significant parameter of democratic teacher attitudes towards students, as there is evidence that female teachers have more democratic behaviors. However, Telatar's (2012) study did not conclude that gender was a factor in democratic teacher attitudes. Since there is no sufficient data to reconcile the different results at this point, it should be effective to conduct qualitative studies that could further investigate teacher attitudes in the schools where the abovementioned surveys were conducted.

The studies on teacher attitudes that have been presented so far in this section have discussed teachers' attitudes towards their students and how teacher-student interactions can be made more democratic. However, one should definitely note that in addition to their interactions in classroom with students, teachers also interact with their colleagues and the school administration. Thus it is important to discuss the studies that explore teachers' interactions with school administrators and the role of these interactions in the development of teachers' attitudes towards students. During the educational process, teachers have to maintain a relationship with the school administration. Principals as school leaders influence teacher attitudes in schools directly (Nir and Kranot, 2006; Price, 2012). Price (2012) explores how the relationship between teachers and school principals influence job satisfaction, cohesion and commitment to work in schools. Price notes that the interactions between teachers and principals affect the attitudes of both the principals and the teachers. Based on the results of The Schools and Staffing Surveys (SASS) of elementary public school principals and teachers in the 2003-2004 school year in the US, Price's findings show that sharing the decision-making power increases the satisfaction, cohesion and commitment levels both for principals and teachers.

Another study by Price (2015) looked into the effect of principals' relationship with teachers on the teachers' perceptions of student engagement. Teachers' perceptions of student engagement were classified into two groups as "academic engagement and general school engagement" (p.118). The Price sample consisted of 257 teachers and 15 principals in the charter schools of Indianapolis. The study used The School Staff Network and School Community Survey and another survey that was designed for this particular research. The findings of the study suggest that having supportive and accessible principals contribute to teachers' development of positive perceptions of student engagement:

Teachers whose principals are more directly reachable have more positive perceptions of their students' academic engagement. In addition, the degree to which teachers believe they have support from their administrators and trust from the school community strongly impacts teachers' perceptions of their students' academic and school engagement. (2015, p.130)

Another study that looked into the teacher-principal interactions in schools was conducted in Gaziantep, Turkey with 534 teachers from 26 elementary schools (Arslan, 2012). This study used two scales: "Democratic Attitudes and Behaviors of Elementary School Principals" and "The Work Satisfaction Survey". The study identified the following as school principals' democratic attitudes: creating an environment that promotes free expression of ideas, enabling teachers to file their complaints and grievances, being just in assigning workload to teachers, taking the opinions of teachers into account in selecting learning materials and equipment, valuing the opinions of teachers, providing teachers with opportunities for professional development, being just and non-discriminatory and valuing cooperation. The study found that democratic attitudes of school principals increased

teacher motivation and positively influenced teachers' attitudes towards their profession and their interactions with their colleagues and students.

This chapter started with introducing different definitions of informal learning and presented the development of the concept in the history of educational studies as well as recent studies that point to the interaction between social and individual aspects in informal learning. This was followed by the discussion of studies that explore informal learning at the workplace which point to its being unstructured and characterized by overlapping social and individual factors. The chapter then moved on to the discussion of the studies on the informal workplace learning of teachers and elaborated on different external and internal factors and resources in teachers' informal workplace learning. Lastly, this section has presented (1) studies on teacher attitudes towards students in the context of classroom management, (2) the factors that make teacher attitudes democratic, (3) the relationship between certain demographic and background characteristics and democratic teacher attitudes, (4) and teachers' interactions with principals and the role of these interactions in teachers' attitudes towards their students. This thesis aims to explore the role of teachers' informal learning experiences at schools in the development of attitudes towards their students that can be placed on the different ends of the democratic attitude continuum, identified by higher and lower degrees of democratic attitudes. Next chapter will introduce the methodology of the study.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

This study aims to explore the role of workplace informal learning that influence teachers' democratic attitudes towards their students. The study used a qualitative approach to understand the role of informal learning in teachers' attitudes towards students at primary school in Istanbul's Kadıköy district. A qualitative research approach was chosen in order to provide an in-depth understanding of teacher attitudes and the role of different factors in the informal workplace learning that influence these attitudes behaviors. Interviews with the selected teachers constituted the main data of the study.

This chapter introduces the design of the research, selection of sample, the instrument for data collection, data analysis and research participants. To recap, the overall research question of this study is as follows:

What is the role of informal learning in the development of teacher attitudes towards students in Turkey?

Within this overall research question, the study explores the following more specific question:

What are the factors in the informal workplace learning of teachers that influence the development of democratic teacher attitudes towards students?

#### 3.1 Research design

This study drew on the principles and practices of a qualitative approach in order to understand the role of informal workplace learning in teachers' development of democratic attitudes towards their students. Qualitative research was used in order to

provide a holistic, particular and in-depth account of the role of informal workplace learning in teacher attitudes towards students.

Qualitative research studies people in real life settings, and instead of testing hypotheses, it tries to identify themes and patterns. According to Merriam (2009), qualitative researchers try to understand “how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences” (p. 6). Merriam (2009) lists essential attributes of qualitative research as follows: “the focus is on process, understanding, and meaning”, “the researcher is the primary instrument of data collection and analysis”, and “the process is inductive”, and “the product is richly descriptive” (p.14).

Also, Firestone (1987) emphasizes the distinction between quantitative and qualitative studies: The qualitative study describes real people acting in real events, whereas the world portrayed in the quantitative study consists of variables and static states (p.19).

### 3.2 Sample

The study used the instrument Democratic Attitude Scale developed by Gözütok (1995) order to select equal number of teachers with the highest and lowest score of democratic attitudes and behaviors.

Kadıköy district was selected because it represents the middle socio-economic status (SES) population in Istanbul. The researcher decided to focus on schools in a middle SES area with the assumption that most of the students at the school would come from middle SES family backgrounds. The reasoning for focusing on middle-income schools was that high SES parents would be more likely to be instrumental in the teachers’ classroom and school practices whereas low income SES parents would be more likely to let the teacher determine the

interactions with the students to a greater extent. Thus when the children of middle-income parents are concerned, a more balanced relationship between the teachers and parents would be more likely. The reason for the selection of 4th grade teachers is based on the assumption that the development of democratic teacher attitudes cannot be sufficiently identified with younger primary school students. Teachers can be more protective and accommodating towards their younger students during their first years at the primary school because young students get acquainted with the rules and expectations of schooling in these first years. Furthermore, teachers express that students are able to clearly understand their guidance, instructions and expectations as of the 4th grade degree.

In addition to the criterion that they teach 4th grade, three other criteria were considered for the teacher selection:

- 1) Having five years of teaching experience,
- 2) Having a permanent position at school,<sup>4</sup>
- 3) Obtaining the highest or lowest scores in the Democratic Attitude Scale.

The purposeful sampling method is used with the intention to focus on teachers' attitudes. Purposeful sampling is based on the premise that the investigator wants to gain insight and hence must "select a sample from which the most can be learned" (Merriam, p.77). According to Patton (2002), purposeful sampling provides the researcher efficient cases for examination.

To start the field study, the permission of the Directorate of the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) of Istanbul was required. The approval document is given in Appendix A. For this reason, the researcher applied to the Directorate

---

<sup>4</sup> There are teachers who work with temporary contracts at state schools as well as teachers who are temporarily assigned to certain schools. This study selected teachers who have a permanent position at their schools so that they would have sufficient informal learning opportunities at the same school.

enlisting the primary schools in the Kadıköy district, the objectives and methodology of the study, personal informal form and the interview questions. The research also applied for permission from the Ethics Committee of Boğaziçi University. The approval document is given in Appendix B. Following the permission of both institutions; the researcher received the permission of Kadıköy District MoNE. The middle SES schools of Kadıköy were selected according to the information obtained from the Director of Primary Education Department. Kadıköy district had 124 teachers who taught 4th grades during the 2012-2013 academic year. 38 of them were not working in middle SES background schools and were thus excluded. Furthermore, it was not possible to conduct the Democratic Attitude Scale with 86 teachers due to various reasons such as their not being willing to take part in the research or their not being at their schools at the scheduled time. In the end, 65 teachers completed the scale; nevertheless the three of them were subsequently eliminated due to fact that they had answered only a few of the questions in the scale. For the sample selection, Democratic Attitude Scale was used because it was used in many studies for evaluating teacher democratic attitudes in the Turkish literature. It is considered as a way of measuring the degree of teachers' democratic attitudes toward students. The Turkish and English versions of personal information forms used for applying the scale are given in Appendix C and D, the Turkish and English versions of the Democratic Attitude Scale is in Appendix E and F. The point list from which the sample was chosen is given in Appendix G.

### 3.3 Democratic attitude scale

This study used the instrument Democratic Attitude Scale developed by Gözütok (1995) in order to select the equal number of teachers with democratic attitudes and behaviors. The scale consists of fifty items and each of them carries an equal weight,

e.g. one point. The sum of points is then ranked from the highest to the lowest scores. This ranking is used to identify whether the participants have higher democratic or lower democratic attitudes. Based on the data derived from this scale, 10 teachers ranking lowest and 10 teachers highest on the democratic attitudes scale were selected for in-depth interviews.

Gözütok (1995)'s Democratic Attitude Scale is derived from G and H forms of "Teacher Opinion on Democracy" Scale, which was developed by the Attitude Research Laboratory and published by Character Research Association in a book format in 1949.

Democratic Attitude Scale consists of 50 items and it has a Likert-Type Scale. Its reliability coefficient is 0.87. There are 32 affirmative and 18 negative items in the scale. Each one is of "agree" or "disagree" form. If the answer is "agree" for an affirmative expression, the participant receives 1 point. Otherwise, the participant receives 0 point. In contrast, for a negative expression, "agree" is equal to 0 point but "disagree" is equal to 1 point. The highest score of the scale is 50 points. This way, teachers were classified by scale points (Gözütok, 1995).

Studies that use this scale follow a conventional way for calculating points. Firstly, mean points and standard deviation are calculated. Then, participants who are above the mean point plus one half standard deviation are considered at "high democratic attitude stage" whereas the others who are below the mean point less than a half standard deviation are at "low democratic attitude stage". The results between the high and low democratic attitudes are identified as "intermediate democratic attitude stage". (Karahan et al. 2006; Dündar, 2013)

Following this conventional method, and based on the data derived from the scale, 10 teachers ranking lowest and highest separately in this scale were selected to

carry out in-depth interviews. Pseudonyms were used instead of the real names of participants.

The interview sample consists of 20 4th grade public primary school teachers in Kadıköy district. Table 3 shows the list of the teachers the researchers interviewed. According to their ranking on the Democratic Attitude Scale, the researcher aimed to interview the highest-ranking 10 teacher and lowest ranking 10 teachers. The tables below show the basic demographic information for the 20 teachers. These teachers were then interviewed and interview data constituted the main body of data.

The list that includes those who were chosen for an interview but did not accept a face-to-face interview is given in Appendix H and Appendix I according to their respective scores. Table 3 contains the list of participants and their demographics.

Table 3. Final List of Interviewees

Pseudonyms	Gender	Age (year)	Amount of Teaching experience (year)	Educational Background	Academic Degree	The Democratic Attitude Scale's Point	
Ayşe	Female	47	27	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	44.18	Highest
Elif	Female	50	20	Faculty of Education	Master's	44.00	
Fidan	Female	45	17	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Bachelor	42.68	
Nermin	Female	62	38	Educational Institute	Associate	41.00	
Ali	Male	49	29	School of Education	Associate	41.00	
Filiz	Female	50	30	Faculty of Education	Associate	41.00	
Nurcan	Female	38	7	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	40.00	
Meral	Female	53	30	Educational Institute	Associate	40.00	
Aysun	Female	47	27	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	40.00	
Mehtap	Female	50	20	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Bachelor	40.00	
Turgut	Male	58	39	Teacher School	Associate	35.00	Lowest
Seda	Female	50	25	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	34.00	
Murat	Male	60	34	Teacher School	Associate	33.69	
Betül	Female	44	18	Faculty of Engineering	Bachelor	33.69	
Esra	Female	63	44	Teacher School	Associate	32.00	
Kemal	Male	47	28	School of Education	Associate	32.00	
Melike	Female	45	25	School of Education	Associate	31.00	
Zeliha	Female	40	18	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	29.17	
Funda	Female	48	25	School of Education	Associate	29.00	
Ahmet	Male	60	40	Teacher School	Associate	28.00	

Table 4. Gender of Sample

		All participants	Those with high scores	Those with low scores
N		20	10	10
Gender	F	15	9	6
	M	5	1	4

Table 4 shows the sample according to gender distribution. The average ages of the participants as those with high scores and as those with low scores are given in Table 5. Table 5 also reports their mean teaching experience and their average ages.

Table 5. Mean Age and Mean Teaching Experience of Sample

		All participants	Those with high scores	Those with low scores
Years	Mean age	50.3	49.1	51.5
	Mean teaching experience	27.05	24.5	29.7

### 3.4 Data collection

Data collection was carried out through interviews. The teachers gathered into groups according to their ranking on the scale were interviewed in this study. The interviews provide the study with raw data for qualitative interpretation.

The researcher conducted individual interviews with ten teachers with the highest and lowest scores. The data was collected during the 2013-2014 academic

year and the interviews were recorded with the informed consent of the participants except for one of them. The researcher did not tape record the interview but instead took notes with the request of one of the participants. The participants were mostly available during lunch break or other break times. The participants taught at 12 different schools. Each interview took about 40 minutes on average in the schools.

### 3.5 Data collection instrument

#### 3.5.1 Interviews

Interviewing is an important data gathering technique that provides rich and in-depth accounts of information, knowledge and experience. According to Bogdan and Biklen (2003), “the interview is used to gather descriptive data in the subjects’ own words so that the researcher can develop insights on how subjects interpret some piece of the world” (p. 94). The semi-structured interviewing was chosen for this study because the questions begin in a structured format but followed by unstructured questions that can be phrased flexibly based on the responses of the interviewees, varying according to the circumstances during the interview (Lichtman, 2006). The study used one-on-one interviewing which is “a data collection process in which the researcher asks questions to and records answers from only one participant in the study at a time” (Creswell, 2012, p.218). The semi-structured interview is the main data gathering technique employed in this study to elicit detailed and in-depth information about the informal learning experiences of 20 classroom teachers at their schools. The Turkish and English versions of the question stated during the interviews are given in Appendix J and Appendix K. The Participant Consent Form was also used during the interviews. The Turkish and English versions may be found in Appendix L and Appendix M.

Before the interviews started, the teachers were explained that permissions for this research had been obtained from MoNE and Boğaziçi University Ethics Committee. Participants were provided with the Participant Informed Consent Form and were informed about their voluntary participation and the confidentiality of the data they provided in this research. The interviews were tape-recorded and participants were each assigned a pseudonym in the transcribed data.

In the interviews, participants were first asked about how they started their teaching career. They were then asked to compare their views and attitudes regarding their profession in the beginning of their career and presently. The questions then asked about the influence of school administration on the teachers' attitudes towards their profession and students. Similarly, the influence of colleagues and parents on the teachers' attitudes towards their students was inquired in the interviews. In addition to these questions, participants were asked about classroom management and how their attitudes towards students have developed over time. Sometimes the participants were asked to elaborate on some topics with additional questions. All the participants were asked in the end whether they wanted to offer any additional information or comment that was not addressed in the interview.

### 3.5.2 Pilot interviews

After conducting the scale, selected two teachers, Erhan and Dilek, who were in the middle of the rank of the Democratic Attitude Scale were interviewed for the pilot study. Erhan graduated from a School of Education and started teaching in 1990. Dilek had graduated from an Educational Institute and then completed her education Bachelor degree in a Faculty of Education. She had more than 30 years of teaching experience. Both had achieved 38 points on the scale.

After the pilot interviews the researcher realized the need for probing questions to ask the participants to elaborate some topics.

### 3.6 Data analysis

The interview data was analyzed by means of content analysis. The interviews were transcribed by the researcher. The data was coded according to the emerging patterns. First of all, the interview data of each participant was analyzed according to emerging themes. Then the themes that repeatedly emerged across the interview data of different participants were identified and finally these major themes were categorized.

After all the interview data were transcribed, the research read the transcriptions several times, immersing herself in the data. First of all, all the interview excerpts about teachers' informal learning were identified. The researcher then classified these excerpts into different themes. One emergent theme was the positive and negative influences of school administration and colleagues that lead to attitude change in teachers. The second theme was teachers' changing attitudes towards students. The excerpts regarding role of parents constituted the third theme. The categories were then identified as interactions with school administration, interactions with colleagues, and interactions with students and communication with parents. When each theme was considered with regard to the differences between teachers with high and lower points, a difference in their interactions with students was revealed. Therefore, participants with high and lower points were separately evaluated for their interactions with students.

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS

This section the themes that emerged from the analysis of interview data will be presented. The themes are interaction with the school administration, interaction with colleagues, interaction with students, and interaction with students' parents. The Turkish versions of the narrations of the participants are in Appendix N.

#### 4.1 Interaction with school administration

As they talked about their interaction with school administration, while some elaborated on the attitudes and behaviors of the administration, some did not comment on the issue.

Almost half of the participants, 9 out of 20, stated that the attitude and behaviors of the school administration influenced them negatively. They listed negative attitudes and behaviors by the administration as being discriminatory, being socially conservative in a puritanical manner and using oppressive practices. On the other hand, two participants noted that they modeled their attitude towards students on that of the administration.

Filiz (50) was one of the experienced teachers and was working at her present school for over ten years. She expressed that she had a quite measured and distanced relationship with the school administration. She found that it was difficult for the administrators to understand the teachers:

Administrators are more concerned about the image of the school... They are not involved in the nitty-gritty of teaching. If they had become administrators after 15-20 years of teaching, maybe, but they usually teach for 3-4 years and become an administrator... They are more management-oriented. (Appendix N, 1.)

Filiz stated that the tension she had with one of the administrators had a negative influence on her attitude and behaviors towards students:

It is important that your mind is relaxed. If you have to force yourself to come to school you cannot gain any success. I had a quarrel with an administrator once. I came to work although I really didn't want to. Then the administrator apologized to me. A teacher needs to be relaxed. During that period, I was not fair towards the students. I was very angry. (Appendix N, 2.)

Nurcan (38) had the least teaching experience, having finished the Education Faculty after working as a nurse and deciding to become a teacher. Nurcan hinted that the oppressive attitude of the school administration influenced her negatively:

If the administrator has a very oppressive attitude I feel that pressure on me and get tense in the classroom. I get into this mood and worry about when he might come and what he might say and this makes me uncomfortable. When I am not comfortable I cannot teach well. However, at the moment our administrator respects us and trusts us. So, I have peace. I am not uncomfortable. Because I am not uncomfortable I carry out my job very well... All I want is that there is no oppressive attitude. What are you late, why is that this way? Why would one be late if there is no problem? (Appendix N, 3.)

Similar to Filiz and Nurcan, Funda (48) stated that her performance sometimes got poor because of the negative attitudes of the school administration:

The behaviors of the school administrators towards teachers are very important... For example, they might criticize or tell off the teachers for the smallest things. If a teacher walks into a classroom with low morale, she then displays a poor performance. There have been a couple of small incidents that influenced me in the past... For example, the bell for class rang and you are not in class, you are late for two minutes, then 'You are late. Where have you been? Why are you not in class?' Such things happened sometimes. (Appendix N, 4.)

Kemal (47) had 28 years of teaching experience and whenever he found it convenient he stated that he started teaching very young and improved his teaching throughout years. He recounted the attitude of a school administrator at one of his previous workplaces:

We had a female vice principal. I was in my 12th or 13th year then. Secondary school students had come to school with hair gel on. These three girls had their hair cut really short, like a boy, and put hair gel on. One of my colleagues, when I was with the administrator, brought these three children. The vice principal said 'How nice your new hairdo is. Have it this way all the time'. The teacher who had brought the children was taken aback. Then our school principal gathered us all and told us that such behavior in children were normal in adolescence, that such things were temporary and we needed to be understanding. The atmosphere in the school got good after that. I witnessed proper administration with the example of those administrators for the first time. (Appendix N, 5.)

Kemal was one of the two teachers who gave examples of educational and inspiring attitudes of the school administration. However, Kemal also mentioned some negative attitudes displayed by the administration of the school where he worked at the time of the interview.

Some students come to school wearing something different than their school uniform. The administration says 'Why do you not have your uniform on?' What harm could come from that? As a teacher, I tolerate that but somehow an administrator cannot let that happen... (Appendix N, 6.)

Kemal then recounted an incident of violence towards a student by an administrator that he could not get out of his mind:

I was in my third year of teaching then... Our colleague who was the acting principal pulled a student's ear in a damaging way. I witnessed violence there. (Appendix N, 7.)

Kemal explained that negative attitudes and behaviors he witnessed were instrumental in shaping his own attitudes towards students, leading him to get away from using violence and making him more tolerant.

Aysun (47), similar to Kemal, stated that she witnessed both positive and negative attitudes of administrators towards students and these attitudes were influential on those of hers:

... For instance, if there is an administrator that uses violence, I contemplate on that and I don't do that or about good behaviors... For

example, if a principal or vice principal is warning a student going out into cold weather with his coat unbuttoned to button up, I say to myself ‘I should do this too.’... Then when you leave the classroom you learn to tell students to button up their coats... (Appendix N, 8.)

As Filiz’s explicit statements and Nurcan and Funda’s more implicit statements suggest the oppressive behaviors and attitudes of school administration have a negative impact on the teacher attitude towards students. Kemal, on the other hand, gave concrete examples of the influence of school administration on his attitude towards students, modeling the democratic behaviors of school administration and not modeling violence towards students perpetrated by school administration. Likewise, Aysun distanced herself from violence and embraced the caring attitude towards students displayed by school administrators.

#### 4.2 Interaction with colleagues

Interview data suggested that following their interactions with students, participants in this study interacted with their colleagues the most. 18 out of 20 participants noted that their colleagues set an example for them with their positive and negative attitudes and behaviors towards students. Some of the accounts on the role of interaction with colleagues in teachers’ attitudes towards students are as follows:

Ayşe recounted that she was very lucky in her first year as a teacher because she was able to learn a lot of things from more experienced teachers. Her account of an occasion about her first year in teaching is as follows:

During my internship, there was a teacher with 40 years of teaching experience. There were so many things, so many challenges, problems... I can never forget how she talked to me and said ‘There will be a lot of incidents with the children. Such things will happen. Do one thing then. Go out of the classroom, take a deep breath, walk up and down the corridor and then go into the classroom and talk to the child. Never forget that they are seven years old.’... We talk with our colleagues, we share things. Of course we influence each other. (Appendix N, 9.)

Aysun (47) listed the negative and positive attitudes displayed by her colleagues and thought that she learned from all of them. Aysun's interview data showed that she worked with teachers who behaved towards students differently based on their economic status as well as teachers who were authoritarian or used violence towards students. Aysun recounted that she also worked with colleagues who did not discriminate against special needs students and treated them equally, not seeing them as a source of problems:

There were positive ones as well negative ones that made me realize I didn't want to be like that. A student for example, there are people, colleagues that judge a student based on her income or physical appearance and teach her accordingly. Teachers who disregard certain students, thinking 'He is that sort of a child anyway'... On the other hand, seeing those colleagues who really care for special needs students, who really work hard for them, I say 'I will take that special needs student' if no one else wanted the child in their classroom... I also witnessed very harsh attitudes. Also I witnessed that students change their attitude once the teacher is out of the classroom. So, it isn't necessary to be that authoritarian. Because you are creating a certain pressure and that pressure disappears when you are gone. It disappears, so I can get angry at a behavior but I won't humiliate a child who didn't do their homework by saying 'Why did you not do your homework?' or by saying 'This handwriting isn't OK.'. I don't tear off students' notebooks or use violence towards them. (Appendix N, 10.)

Kemal recounted how he learned to communicate with his students by adjusting the tone of his voice thanks to a colleague and the positive influence of this:

We had a colleague... I saw this very positive example he displayed... I am generally considered quite tough towards students, I got on with students by talking openly. We tried to communicate in the crowds. I tried to get heard by shouting. Then this colleague joined us and I observed him in the classroom, in the school garden. I realized that he talked to the students just like he would with his own children or wife. I saw how he respected students, talked to them gently by adjusting his voice. I also realized the impact it had on the children... This was something that set a good example for me. I think that without raising my voice in the classroom I won't break children's hearts. This was an impressive achievement I gained thanks to my colleague. (Appendix N, 11.)

Another account of Kemal regarding one of his colleagues, on the contrary, concerns an unacceptably negative behavior displayed by the colleague. He stated that the violence of his colleague on one student prevented Kemal from being a violent teacher:

... This was about 16-17 years ago. One of my colleagues kicked a student, used violence. The student collapsed. After seeing the state that child was in, I never hit a child again. I never laid hands on a student and saw how wrong violence is and where it might end up. (Appendix N, 12.)

Betül (44) was a teacher with 18 years of teaching experience. Similar to Kemal, she was influenced by the constructive relationship that a colleague of hers established with a student deemed troublesome and she adopted this behavior herself:

A colleague had a troublesome student... I often saw this colleague talking to this student in the recess, his hand on the student's shoulder, showing affection and understanding.... And I saw the development that the student displayed as well. That is to mean I witnessed how students with challenges progressed if they are approached with affection... That colleague contributed to my teaching a lot. (Appendix N, 13.)

The accounts below show that Ayşe followed her colleague's advice regarding anger management during her first year of teaching. Aysun modeled her behavior on her colleagues' positive behaviors regarding not discriminating among the students. Furthermore, Aysun had made up her mind that she should not carry out the negative behaviors of her colleagues. Similar to Aysun, Kemal stopped shouting at his students by taking one of his colleagues as an example. Kemal had also got convinced that teacher violence on students is destructive and unacceptable by witnessing it carried out by a colleague. As for Betül, she modeled her behaviors on a colleague's concern with a student with certain issues at the time.

In addition to the accounts above, there were other participants who stated that they modeled their own attitudes and behaviors on their colleagues' attitudes toward students. Meral explained that if she experienced a problem with one of her

students in her classroom she told this to her colleagues in the teachers' room and by contemplating different opinions from her colleagues she decided what the best course of action would be:

Different opinions are voiced, we talk... Say, I got angry with a student, she tore off her notebook in front of my eyes. I had only said 'How did you write like this?' ... I tell this to my colleagues in the teachers' room: 'Colleagues, this is what the student did. What should I do? I didn't say anything to this student in the classroom among her peers.' My colleagues suggested that I go to our guidance and counsellor colleague. But I chose to speak with the child first. I called the child and asked 'My girl, why did you do this?' She said 'I was angry at something else then. Because you got angry at me without listening to me, I tore off my notebook'. I said 'Let's listen to each other. I perceived what you did as disrespectful toward myself.' This student then went to the guidance counsellor and it emerged that she had psychological issues related with her family.' I tell my colleagues both good things and bad things that happen in the classroom because they give me different ideas. I adopt the one that I find most suitable and behave towards the student accordingly and talk to her. (Appendix N, 14.)

As for Fidan, she learned about how a colleague of hers punished a student and found this unacceptable:

... When the student did not follow a rule, she sent the student outside of the classroom. The student leaves the classroom and waits outside of the door. I don't approve of this. This is a negative example and not good at all. (Appendix N, 15.)

Nurcan stated that if one of her colleagues told her about a positive example about classroom management, she tried to use the same method herself. Likewise, Nermin explained that she adopted the positive attitudes of a colleague of hers towards students. Similar to Nermin, Funda stated that she adopted the gentle attitude of one of her colleagues towards students. To sum up, almost all of the participants, 18 out of 20, recounted how their colleagues' attitudes towards students influenced their own attitudes by providing detailed accounts or through more general statements.

### 4.3 Interaction with students

The majority of the participants, 14 out of 20, stated that their attitudes towards students changed over time. Such changes in teacher attitudes towards students included developing more gentle attitudes, taking students' opinions into consideration, getting tolerant and stopping violent behaviors. The participants' accounts in this section will be classified based on their ranking on the Democratic Attitude Scale, as those with high and low points.

Some of the teachers who scored on the high end of the scale developed their attitudes based on student participation and opinions. Ayşe, who scored the highest on the scale, explained that she realized that she needed to change a number of her attitudes because she saw that her attitude was mimicked by the students:

I used to speak with a higher tone of voice in the first years. I then realized that students spoke with each other in the same tone. You tell off someone and see that after a while they do the same... Now I speak with a more reasonable tone of voice... (Appendix N, 16.)

Ayşe also stated that she found student participation vital in classroom management:

Classroom rules settle in with the help of your character, your wishes, the participation of students, by taking into consideration the specific conditions of the children in that classroom... I believe that it is beneficial to create rules with the students because they control each other a lot more easily, such as this is what we suggested but we are not displaying this behavior... (Appendix N, 17.)

Fidan has 17 years of teaching experience. She learned to empathize with students and be more accommodating towards students by learning from her own experiences:

I carry out each behavior, each utterance by contemplating on it. I learned how to do this and how to be patient with children. Empathy, I started empathizing more and putting myself in the shoes of the students. I tried to see things from their points of view... In the beginning, you think 'They are just children' and disregard them but their worlds are really different and it is important to take into consideration the opinions

of each one of them... I learned a lot from spending time with children. (Appendix N, 18.)

Similar to Ayşe, Fidan focused on the importance of involving children in the process of establishing rules:

I act with positive discipline in mind. I try to set the rules together with the students. When students participate all the time, when they contribute something as well, they follow the rules they themselves created more. (Appendix N, 19.)

As for Nurcan, she stated that starting from the day she started teaching she sought what she was lacking as a teacher and tried to improve her teaching:

About classroom management, about children, I am trying to get to know their worlds... For example, in the beginning I think I was pretending to listen to the children but I wasn't really listening to them carefully... but now I listen to them well, I listen to what the student is trying to tell me well. If it is a situation where I cannot listen to the student, I say 'Just a minute, I will listen to you later'. (Appendix N, 20.)

What Nurcan paid attention to in the process of establishing classroom rules was similar to Ayşe's and Fidan's points:

I make sure that I do an exercise on classroom rules at the beginning of the term. I make the students part of this process as well... We establish the correct behaviors together through the use of drama. We perform the incorrect behaviors. How was it like this, how was it like that? Or I show some slides to the children. I try to make children a part of the rules because in order for children to own the rules we need to make the rules together. (Appendix N, 21.)

Meral explained that she was tough towards children in the first years of her teaching career and gradually realized that this attitude made her students timid and unresponsive.

When you treat students in a tough manner you realize that they get timid and cannot even respond when they know the correct answer to a question. You gradually quit that attitude. You see the positive outcome when you act gently to students... (Appendix N, 22.)

Meral stated that she established the classroom rules by keeping the visuals on the class rules in the classroom and by writing the rules on the board together with students:

Starting from the first grade, the rules of the school, classroom rules, constantly rules, we write them on the board with students... I have the rules in the form of pictures in my classroom at the moment. (Appendix N, 23.)

The accounts above were from teachers who scored on the high end of the scale. As for the teachers who scored on the low end, there were accounts where teachers emphasized their own opinions and initiatives in their interactions with students as well as accounts of different approaches to classroom management. Ahmet, who scored the lowest on the scale, stated that when he could not establish a relationship of affection between himself and a student that student had to be transferred out from his classroom to elsewhere:

With students, I have certain attitudes, a certain way of teaching, the attitudes that were taught to me, that I gained in 40 years. Students even like my shouting at them; really, they are not offended by my acts. I establish this bridge of love between the students and myself in the first week. Things start and proceed with that bridge of love... But the bridges that I cannot build, I cannot do it sometimes. Then the student has to go. It stems both from the student and from myself. (Appendix N, 24.)

As for Funda, who scored the second lowest on the scale, she explained that her attitude towards students became gentler after she became a mother and that she could never manage her classroom the way she wanted to:

Things changed after I became a mother. I started to understand the children better. In the beginning I could get angry very quickly. Throughout the years after becoming a mother you get more tolerant in time. I think that by being gentler to students you start to see that you get more respectful... I have a problem with getting the rules accepted in the classroom. This is my deficiency or it is because of me? Some colleagues are such that even when they are outside of the classroom the entire class is totally silent but I never had such a class. (Appendix N, 25.)

Zeliha who scored the third lowest on the scale, has 18 years of teaching experience. She explained that she wanted the students to know that she could get tough when needed and she raised her voice to attract the attention of students. At the same time, she added that she made it known to the students not only the teacher but they, as students, could also establish the classroom rules.

...There is such a thing in my method that it is tough sometimes, that my voice is high and I am seriously tough sometimes but generally I raise my voice to attract attention sometimes... In the beginning with a gentle attitude but that I could get tough when necessary but since I didn't find it necessary I did this thing, I tried to create the awareness that they could actually establish classroom rules. (Appendix N, 26.)

Zeliha also explained that she could become critical of her own attitude towards students and at times apologized to the students about her attitude:

During my difficult times, this might be when I am on duty during the recess or in other difficult situations, I can treat the students not in a correct way. My wrong behavior toward the student and the classroom, that a wrong behavior could be displayed by any person but a teacher needed to be more careful and I shouldn't have acted like that... There have been times when I apologized to the student and addressed her hurt feelings. But there have been times when I made mistakes, I had tough attitudes, I used the wrong method. (Appendix N, 27.)

Kemal had recounted how he had distanced himself from the use of violence on students by witnessing an administrator use violence towards a student. He explained his current attitudes as follows:

You quit violence. As you quit violence, you try to find a middle way along with students. You have to do this job. You have to do your profession. How can you do this in these circumstances? How can you establish this system? It emerges as you contemplate on it... (Appendix N, 28.)

In relation to the classroom rules, Kemal points to the importance of students applying the classroom rules of their own accord:

I think that you can establish discipline through students' own auto-control system... I could explain how this would work with an example. First of well, children need to be helped with the development of their

personalities in the classroom and should be evaluated accordingly. They will then try to manage the classroom in a manner where they discuss things and assess or criticize each other. (Appendix N, 29.)

Murat, who scored the eight lowest on the scale, explained his changing attitudes towards students in detail as follows:

Of course my attitude was tougher in the first years. I even used beating sometimes in the villages. The parents came and you met with the family and explained this and that and the parents said ‘You can beat the child then’... Our own teachers beat us a lot as well. Some had even made a habit of it... As our social culture improved, as we became familiar with professional books, we deserted that practice... I later realized that being oppressive towards students, insulting them is in a way insulting ourselves... Let me add that I sometimes used the method of isolating the student (he means sending the student outside the classroom) but we saw that this behavior is not correct. (Appendix N, 30.)

#### 4.4 Interaction with parents

When it came to interaction with parents, more than half of the participants stated that parents did not have an influence on their profession or their attitude towards students. They (11 out of 20) noted that they communicated with parents when they needed to discuss a specific situation or issue about a student. Some of the teachers, who scored low on the scale, made critical comments on the parents’ expectations from them (3 out of 10).

Elif thought that parents would not influence her teaching:

On my profession, they don’t have a power of sanction on me, so they cannot guide me. I establish my professional principles and keep the parents behind a certain line. Parents cannot intervene in my classes academically. I mean I won’t let them establish such a relationship. (Appendix N, 31.)

Elif, who scored the second highest on the Democratic Attitude Survey, used to join the parents and teachers meeting of her nephew before she became a teacher. She explained that now that she was a teacher she took expectations of others from her into consideration:

...not only what I know, what I consider right but I have tried to create a teaching profile based also on the expectations of the those around me (parent-student) and my own expectations. (Appendix N, 32.)

Murat's opinions on the role of interactions with parents in the development of his attitudes were in line with the statements above:

What parents know about teaching does not have a scientific content. Neither in this school nor in the previous ones, are parents in a position to offer such suggestions. In terms of literacy. (Appendix N, 33.)

On the other hand, Murat also stated that some of the parents of his students were teachers and brought him professional books:

I received professional books from some of the parents in my class, from the parents who are teachers, books as gifts on teachers' day. (Appendix N, 34.)

Ahmet, who scored the lowest on the scale, described the problems he experienced with parents as follows:

You are a great teacher if you sweet-talk with parents, if you pamper the student and without giving anything saying 'You are great. You are super', which is used here a lot... Students are like this because teachers tell parents what the parents want to hear, not what they actually want to say. ...I am not gentle towards parents. I tell their mistakes to their faces openly. I tell all the characteristics of their children to their faces... While students are being allocated to each class, I was given the children of apartment janitors. I went to the administration and asked them 'Why are these lists like this?'....What they told me is this: 'Your colleagues did this, not us. Whatever it was that the parents were told they were scared of you and couldn't let their children go into your classroom'. Yes, I was tough... (Appendix N, 35.)

Funda, who scored the second lowest on the scale, explained that at her school parents had high expectations from the teachers and she took this into account:

For example, when I explain a topic I would like to explain it in detail. I try to do that so that all of the students understand it. I mean in the past I wasn't quite like this. I skipped some things, I didn't quite have this awareness then. It has developed over the years. And of course the place you work at is like this. Parents have different expectations from you. They might not have that many expectations in rural areas because parents there don't focus on their children that much but here things are different. Parents have expectations. They have researched schools and

came here; they have different expectations from you. So, even if you don't want, that (awareness that one needs to be thorough in her teaching) develops on its own. (Appendix N, 36.)

Betül, who scored the seventh lowest on the scale, thought that parents commented on things they were not qualified to comment on:

...This is usually this case in our society. For example, someone is a medical doctor and he goes on a TV show and comments on things irrelevant to his profession. It is as if we know a lot, as if we know about everything. Even if we don't have the education we express an opinion. There are some parents who do that. (Appendix N, 37.)

On the other hand, Seda, who scored the ninth lowest on the scale, provided a different account of the problems she experienced with the parents at her school:

Parents rule the teachers now. Because they can sanction you it is as if you are guiding the children. When you tell off a student in class you wonder whether the child will go and complain to the principal. This is because this is my fifth year here and four years ago I experienced this at this school a lot... I worked with a group of parents who put all sorts of pressure on their children at home but here they didn't even let the teacher say to the students 'Move aside a bit'. My current group of parents is better because they aren't from around here... These are children from low-income families. Because that family anxiety, affection towards your seniors, towards teachers continue, I like this group of parents more. (Appendix N, 38.)

Seda gave examples of parents' high expectations from the teachers:

'Why did you yell at her but not at her friend?', 'Why did you not let her go to the toilet??' ... I was influenced badly by these. I was tense when I went into the classroom. Parents monitor such things a lot these days. What they mean is, forget about everything at home and only pay attention to my child. But they don't know whether their child can receive what you give, whether the child can respond accordingly. They try to guide the teacher more, they try to guide teacher behaviors. (Appendix N, 39.)

Aysun, on the other hand, gave examples of how her communication with parents influenced her attitudes toward students positively:

For example, parents who told me about the special conditions of their children, who didn't hide things from me changed my attitudes and behaviors. For example, a child is always sleepy in class. You ask 'Were you not able to sleep at night?', 'I couldn't sleep.' He has a bedwetting

problem. The mother gets him up, washes him and all. Or there is an elderly person at home. When parents share such things with you and when you ask of course your behavior towards students changes. (Appendix N, 40.)

This chapter presented the findings from interview data that provided examples of how teachers' attitudes towards students were formed and developed through their interactions with the school administrators, their colleagues, students and parents. Findings showed how some interactions and teachers' informal learning through these interactions influenced their attitude their students negatively such as the stress they felt in the classroom because of the oppressive measures by the administration or because of parents' expectations from them which they found unjust and unachievable. However, findings also suggested that informal learning in some interactions at school led teachers towards more democratic attitudes toward their students. Examples included teachers quitting the use of violent acts and speech on their students, teachers learning to speak gently and respectfully with students, teachers learning anger management and participatory classroom management methods through informal learning at school. The following chapter will summarize the findings and present a discussion of these findings in relation to the literature.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the findings on how teachers' informal learning through their interactions with administrators, colleagues, students and parents influence their attitudes towards their students. The chapter discusses these findings in relation to the relevant literature.

20 participants took part in this study and the data was collected through semi-structured interviews with the teachers which were all recorded except for one (19 out of 20). The interviews were analysed by means of the content analysis.

#### 5.1 The effects of interactions with school administration on teachers' attitudes

The findings suggest that teachers' interactions with school administration have both negative and positive effects on teachers' attitudes towards students. Filiz, Nurcan, and Funda pointed out that if there was a tension between them and the school administrators, the students were negatively influenced by this situation. The accounts of Filiz, Nurcan and Funda suggested that when the administrator put pressure on the teachers or criticized them for reasons teachers found unjust, the teachers felt uncomfortable and passed this onto their students, making it difficult for them to teach effectively and be just towards the students in their classroom interactions.

Other findings on teachers' informal learning through their interactions with school administrators and how this learning influenced their democratic attitudes towards students concern accounts from Kemal and Aysun described how an administrator used violence against a student and how she resolved not to do so herself by observing and learning from this incident. Kemal also explained how an

administrator used violence against a student and Kemal's informal learning through this incident was that he would never resort to violence against a student. Kemal also provided another account about his informal learning through interacting with school administrators. In this account, Kemal explained how the administrators' respect towards adolescent students' out-of-the-ordinary hairdo taught him the importance of taking students' age and developmental characteristics into account in identifying teacher attitudes toward them. For Kemal, both the negative and the positive incidents involving school administrators were instructive and helped him develop more democratic attitudes towards the students. Similarly, Aysun explained that by observing the caring attitude of administrators towards the students, she learned how to be caring towards the students, e.g. reminding them of dressing warmly in cold weather, and by witnessing the violence by an administrator against a student, she became determined that she would not use violence against students.

These anecdotes show that teachers' interactions with administrators and what they learn informally from these interactions affect their attitudes towards students directly. The findings of this study suggest that administrators' undue pressure on teachers could negatively affect teachers' attitudes towards their students. The findings also show that teachers' own attitudes towards students are affected by the oppressive or tolerant and respectful attitudes of the administrators towards students.

These findings are in line with Price's (2012) findings, which suggest that less hierarchical relationships between teachers and principals contribute to a positive school climate and the strict hierarchy in school leads to stress in teachers and administrators. The findings from this study with teachers in Istanbul suggests

that when the interactions between administrators and teachers cause stress for teachers, this can also lead to less democratic teacher attitudes towards students. Likewise, Price (2012) suggests that “interpersonal relationships with persons at work can positively influence individual worker commitment, cohesion, and satisfaction” (p.53). Also, another study by Price (2015) studied the cooperation between principals and their teachers and found that when there is a higher degree of cooperation teachers had more positive approaches towards their students’ school engagement. The findings summarized above also suggest that positive and more equal interactions between school administrators and teachers contributed to democratic teacher attitudes towards students.

The findings of this study with teachers in Kadıköy, Istanbul are also in line with the findings of another study conducted in Turkey which studied the effect of primary school principals’ democratic attitudes and behaviors on teacher motivation and student performance (Arslan, 2012). Arslan’s study showed that democratic attitudes and behaviors of school principals’ dramatically influenced not only the teachers’ motivation but also the teachers’ relationships with other persons in the school including their students.

To sum up, there is a connection between school administrators’ attitudes and behaviors towards teachers and teachers’ own attitudes towards their students. Teachers’ informal learning through their interactions with school administrators seems to influence their attitude towards students. In some cases, this informal learning leads teachers towards more democratic behaviors such as respecting students’ choices about their own appearance, stopping using violence against students or resolving to never doing so or leading them. In other cases, the conflict with the administration and feeling disrespected by the administration lead some

teachers towards less democratic behaviors towards students such as not being just and understanding to students in the classroom interactions.

## 5.2 The effects of interactions with colleagues on teachers' attitudes

The findings of this study suggest that participants consider interactions with colleagues to have an effect on their attitudes towards students. Their accounts of such interactions included receiving advice from more experienced colleagues about they should do or not when they started teaching. Aysun's informal learning through interaction with colleagues was about not discriminating against certain students. Through observing their colleagues who established an equal relationship in their dialogues with the students, Betül and Kemal learned the importance of speaking with students with respect as their equals. Furthermore, Kemal explained that he stopped using violence against students by observing another colleague use violence against a student and its impact on the student.

There were other accounts from teachers that explained their informal learning through their interactions with their teacher colleagues and how this learning influenced their attitudes towards students. Ayşe, for example, explained how in her first year as a teacher she learned to exercise anger management and remember her duty towards children as an adult from an experienced teacher. Fidan observed that another colleague sent children who did not follow classroom rules outside the classroom, which was a practice she strongly disagreed with. Meral's account explained how she consulted her colleagues in the teachers' room about certain issues with her students, discussing different points of view and choosing the one that she found most appropriate.

The findings showed that there were informal interactions between the teachers and their informal learning through such interactions included anger

management, avoiding discrimination between students, avoiding violence against students, listening to students and trying to understand their students' points of views. Such informal learning was achieved through dialogue with colleagues, discussing issues related with students with colleagues and brainstorming with them, listening to more experienced colleagues' advice and observing colleagues' interactions with students.

These findings are similar to the five general categories of learning activities identified in Meirink et al.'s study (2009). These categories were "doing, experimenting, reflecting, learning from others without interaction, and learning from others with interaction" (p.210). In light of this, the informal learning of the teachers' in this study can be classified categories as learning from others without interaction, and learning from others with interaction. Learning informally from colleagues, without interaction included (1) observing colleagues' democratic attitudes such as trying to communicate with students and taking their opinions in the most challenging situations and not discriminating against some groups of students and adopting these democratic attitudes, (2) observing colleagues' unacceptable attitudes such as using violence against students, punishing students with inappropriate means and discriminating against some groups of students and not adopting these attitudes.

Learning informally from colleagues with interaction in this study included discussing own experiences and problems with students with colleagues, listening to colleagues' experiences with students and their ways of handling challenges with students and putting the advice of colleagues into practice in interactions with students.

Findings of this study are also in line with Hoekstra et al.'s study (2009). Hoekstra et al. explained that teachers' interactions with each other could be classified as "teacher autonomy, teacher collaboration, reflective dialogue, receiving feedback, experience of shared norms and responsibility" (p. 280). Among the findings of these study, informal learning with interaction with colleagues include discussing own experiences and problems with students with colleagues, listening to colleagues' experiences with students and their ways of resolving problems with students and putting the advice of colleagues into practice. These correspond to Hoekstra et al.'s (2009) teacher collaboration, reflective dialogue and experience of shared norms and responsibility. According to Hoekstra et al., teacher collaboration reflects the level of interdependency and high level of interdependency leads to more learning. Thus, the teachers in this study who discuss with colleagues in this study can be considered as cooperating with their colleagues. Taking the advice of other colleagues, on the other hand, could be regarded as reflective dialogue. Lastly, the participants in this study explained how they talked about how they should they behave a student in teachers' room and how they came to an agreement as a result of this discussion, which can be regarded as the experience of shared norms and responsibility as identified by Hoekstra et al.'s (2009).

### 5.3 The effects of interactions with students on teachers' attitudes

The findings suggest that participants who scored high on the Democratic Attitudes Survey found that informal learning through their interactions with the students helped them develop more democratic attitudes towards students. This informal learning mostly took place when teachers observed students' reactions to teacher attitude and behaviors and adjusted their attitudes accordingly. For example, Ayşe who had scored highest on the survey observed that when she talked to her students

in a loud voice her students imitated this, which led her to use a gentler and more appropriate speaking voice. Fidan explained how she developed empathy towards her students and learned from her students. Nurcan explained that she first reflected on her teaching practices and then listened to her students' opinions on her teaching practices and adjusted her behavior accordingly. Meral's account explained how her unkind attitude towards students affected student performance which led her to adopt more respectful and participatory attitudes towards students which helped students behave and perform better in the classroom.

Ayşe, Fidan, Nurcan and Meral are among the group who scored high on the survey and their accounts suggested that they created the classroom rules together with the students at the beginning of the school term and performed activities to help students develop and gain ownership of the rules. Their accounts also showed that they shared responsibility and decision-making power with their students in the classroom management, which are among the characteristics of a democratic classroom according to Pepper and Henry (1985).

On the other hand, Ahmet who scored lowest point on the scale had explained that if he could not 'build a bridge of love' between himself and one of his students the student had to be transferred to another class. He also claimed that students did not mind his shouting at them and even enjoyed it. He found that this attitude had developed over many years and not that different from the attitude of his own teachers some of whom regularly used violence against students.

Funda, who had scored lowest on the scale, explained that her attitude towards students became more sensitive and understanding after she became a mother, which led students to show more respect towards her. Funda also self-critical

about her classroom management skills and considered teachers whose students were quiet even after their teacher left the classroom successful.

Zeliha, who had scored the third lowest, explained that she used teacher-centered classroom management techniques. Zeliha was self-critical of her attitudes towards students. She explained that when she adopted rude and impolite attitudes towards students when she was tired, which she apologized for to the students later on.

Kemal, who had scored the fifth lowest on the scale, explained that he stopped using violence against the students and realized that when students gained ownership of classroom rules they followed them much better. Murat, who had scored the eighth lowest on the scale, explained that he used violence against students to punish them but changed this attitude through experience and increased familiarity with books on the teaching profession.

Among the participants who scored low on the scale, Funda, Melike and Betül suggested that they established classroom rules along with the students. However, their accounts of this participatory process was not detailed as those of the teachers who scored high on the scale.

The findings summarized above suggest that the participants who scored high on the Democratic Attitude Survey developed more democratic attitudes towards students through informal learning achieved through their interactions with the students in teaching-learning settings. It can be suggested that their learning through their interactions with students is related to their personal qualities.

Although Ayşe did not express herself on her personality, she seemed confident about problematic situations in the classroom. Also, Fidan said: "I won't be very humble. Sometimes I know the child better than their own parents and I

speak considering their individual characteristics too.”<sup>5</sup>She was always appreciated by the principals and parents of the students. Ali who has the fifth highest points said thathe was a very ambitious student. He expressed that “(...) I never had any problems with students in my life. There is no behavior that cannot be dealt with. Even the bad person has a point where you can reach them... I am not someone who would say ‘I fought so far, I cannot do it anymore’<sup>6</sup> Nurcan with the seventh highest points expressed that “(...) because I am a determined person, I will somehow succeed.”<sup>7</sup> She seeks guidance from seminars, books or Internet for her job. Moreover, Filiz, Nermin, and Mehtap also made similar comments. According to our study, teachers with higher democratic attitudes seem to have more self-confidence. This seems to be in agreement with the conclusions in Kapıcı Zengin (2003), Almog and Shechtman (2007) and Zehir Topkaya and Yavuz (2011). Self-efficacy, and the use of helpful strategies are correlated with each other according to Almog and Shechtman (2007). Kapıcı Zengin (2003) found that elementary teacher’s self-efficacy and positive communication patterns in the classroom are correlated each other. Zehir Topkaya and Yavuz (2011) also suggested that there is a positive correlation between the democratic values and self-efficacy perceptions of pre-service teachers.

#### 5.4 The effects of interactions with students’ parents on teachers’ attitudes

Findings are not sufficient to suggest any considerably effect of interaction with parents on the development of democratic teacher attitudes towards students.

Participants’ accounts suggested that when the parents told the teachers about a

---

<sup>5</sup>“ Çok da mütevazî olamayacağım, bazen hatta kendi anne babalarından iyi tanırım çocuğu ve o şekilde bireysel özelliklerini de dikkate alarak konuşurum.”

<sup>6</sup>“ ... Öğrencilerle hayatım boyunca sorunum olmadı. Halledilemeyecek bir davranış yoktur. Kötü insanın bile ulaşılabilir bir noktası vardır... Ben bu kadar mücadele ettim artık daha fazla edemem diyecek biri değilim.”

<sup>7</sup>“ ... çünkü azimli bir insanım bir şekilde başarırım.”

specific issue about their children teachers took this into consideration in their interactions with students. On the other hand, among the participants who scored low on the scale, the accounts of Ahmet and Seda suggest that they were criticized by the parents because of their attitudes towards students. The accounts suggest that some of these criticisms took the form of complaints about these teachers to the school administration. Ahmet and Seda's accounts suggested that they were not to blame and parents had unrealistically high expectations of them.

Furthermore, Funda, one of the participants who scored low on the scale, found that educated parents had high expectations of her as a teacher, which put pressure on her. Betül suggested that some parents intervened in teachers' work in relation to matters on which they were not qualified to comment. On the other hand, Murat's account suggested that some parents' encouragement of teacher violence against students delayed Murat's abandoning the use of violence.

As for the existing research on parents' expectations of teachers, Kaya's (2012) study looked into the expectations of parents of primary school students in Sakarya of the teachers. Her findings showed that first and foremost parents expected teachers to have sufficient vocational qualifications and found that the teachers at their children's school were sufficiently qualified. The study also found that parents find it important that teachers pay enough attention to their opinions when they have discussions with the teachers. Parents in Kaya considered the teachers of their children to pay enough attention to parent's opinions. The findings of this study suggest that parents do not question the professional competence of the teachers. However, it can be suggested that some of the teachers who scored low on the survey were criticized by some parents because of their attitudes towards students.

Furthermore, some of the teachers who scored low on the survey explained that they felt under pressure because some educated parents' expectations of them.

## CHAPTER 6

### CONCLUSION AND FINAL REMARKS

This study found that informal learning through interactions with school administrations, colleagues, and students provided the teachers in this study with opportunities to develop democratic attitudes towards students. The findings show that informal learning at school has been influential on the teachers' attitudes towards students and this informal learning provided the teachers with the knowledge to self-reflect on and change their attitudes towards students.

Informal learning through interactions with school administration affected teachers' attitudes towards students. Firstly, if the teachers felt under intense and undue pressure from the administration, this created stress for them influencing their classroom interactions with students negatively. Secondly, teachers judged their principals' attitudes towards students as acceptable or not. Informal learning through observations of these attitudes led the teachers to adjust their own attitudes towards students.

- Teachers' interactions with their colleagues provided numerous opportunities for informal learning. Firstly, the teachers in study observed their colleagues attitudes towards students. They classified their colleagues' attitudes as acceptable and unacceptable. Then, they used this informal learning to adjust their own attitudes towards students. Secondly, teachers shared their own experiences and issues with students with their colleagues. Also, they listened to their colleagues' teaching experiences. They then used the informal learning through these interactions to develop democratic teacher attitudes towards students. Lastly, teachers received the advice of their more

experienced colleagues about teaching and classroom management issues, especially during their first years, and used this learning to develop democratic teacher attitudes.

- Teachers also learned informally through their interactions with their students to change their attitudes democratically. However, it appears that the teachers who scored high on the survey strived more to develop democratic attitudes towards students than the teachers who scored low on the survey.
- Some of the teachers who scored low on the survey indicated that they were criticized by parents because of their attitudes and behaviors towards students. Furthermore, some of the teachers who scored low on the survey felt uncomfortable because of parents' expectations of them.

#### 6.1 Limitations of the study

The limitations of this research can be identified as follows:

- This study used the one-off interview data with 20 teachers in Kadıköy, Istanbul who were selected based on their scores on the Democratic Attitude Survey. In the study, data from interviews with a limited number of teachers only in Kadıköy district were used.
- It should be considered that some of the participants might have given what they thought were socially acceptable answers. Furthermore, they were unwilling to talk about their interactions with their school principal and their violent attitudes towards students.
- Teachers' democratic attitudes were identified only with the Democratic Attitude Survey administered to them. Observations in the school and classroom settings would have contributed to a better understanding of the development of teacher democratic attitudes towards students.

## 6.2 Recommendations for further research

It is important to understand how teachers develop democratic attitudes towards in order to provide effective and participatory classroom and educational goals.

Recommendations for further research can be listed as follows:

- Research that explores the development of democratic teacher attitudes towards students should be conducted with teachers that work with students from different SES backgrounds.
- Ethnographic methods should be used in order to produce a multi-faceted and more in-depth understanding of how informal learning at school influences the development of teacher attitudes towards students.
- There is a need for studies that focus on the interactions between school administration and teachers and the ways in which these interactions influence teacher attitudes towards their students.
- There is a need for studies that focus on the role of teachers' interactions with parents in the development of teacher attitudes towards students.
- The role of teachers' personal qualities such as self-efficacy, autonomy and dedication to lifelong learning in the development of teacher attitudes towards students should be explored.

## APPENDIX A

### MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION APPROVAL

T.C.  
İSTANBUL VALİLİĞİ  
İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü

13/05/2013

Sayı : 59090411-605.01- 57099  
Konu : Anket (Rahşan SÖNMEZ)

BOĞAZIÇI ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
(Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsüne)

İlgi : a) 16.04.2013 gün ve 48 sayılı yazımız.  
b) İst. Valilik Makamının 08.05.2013 tarihli ve 55863 sayılı onayı.

Üniversiteniz Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yetişkin Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi Rahşan SÖNMEZ'in "Okullardaki İnfomal Öğrenme Deneyimleri Esnasında Öğretmenlerin Otoriter ve Demokratik Tutumları Geliştirilmesinde Etki Eden Faktör" konulu tezine ilişkin anket çalışması istemi hakkında ilgi (a) yazınız ilgi (b) Valiliğimiz Onayı ile uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi ve ilgi (b) Valilik Onayı doğrultusunda gerekli duyurunun araştırmacı anketçi tarafından yapılmasını, işlem bittikten sonra 2 (iki) hafta içinde sonuçtan Müdürlüğümüz Strateji Geliştirme Bölümüne rapor halinde bilgi verilmesini arz ederim.

Kahraman DEMİREL  
Müdür a.  
Şube Müdürü

EKLER:  
Ek-1 Valilik Onayı.  
2 Anket Soruları.

NOT: Verilecek cevapta tarih, numara ve dosya numarasını yazılması rica olunur.  
STRATEJİ GELİŞTİRME BÖLÜMÜ E-Posta: sgh34@meh.gov.tr  
ADRES: İl Millî Eğitim Müdürlüğü D Blok Bab-ı Ali Cad. No:13 Çarşafı  
Telefon: Snt.212.455 04 00 Dahili: 239

5070 Sayılı Kanuna Göre  
KAHRAMAN DEMİREL tarafından  
Elektronik Olarak  
İnzalanmıştır. http://istanbul.meb.  
tr/evrakongul adresinden  
kontrol edebilirsiniz.

## APPENDIX B

# BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY HUMAN RESEARCH INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL

BOĞAZIÇI ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
İnsan Araştırmaları Kurumsal Değerlendirme Kurulu (İNAREK) Toplantı Tutanağı  
2013/3

17.06.2013

Rahşan Sönmez,  
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü,  
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi,  
Bebek 34342 İstanbul

Sayın Araştırmacı,

"Okullardaki informal öğrenme deneyimleri esnasında öğretmenlerin otoriter ve demokratik tutum geliştirmesine etki eden faktörler" başlıklı projeniz ile yaptığımız Boğaziçi Üniversitesi İnsan Araştırmaları Kurumsal Değerlendirme Kurulu (İNAREK) 2013/53 kayıt numaralı başvuru 17.06.2013 tarihli ve 2013/3 sayılı kurul toplantısında incelenerek etik onay verilmesi uygun bulunmuştur.

Saygılarımızla,

Prof. Dr. Hande Çağlayan (Başkan)  
Moleküler Biyoloji ve Genetik Bölümü,  
Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi  
İstanbul

Prof. Dr. Yeşim Atamer (üye)  
Hukuk Fakültesi,  
İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi  
İstanbul

Prof. Dr. Betül Baykan-Baykal (üye)  
Nöroloji Bölümü, İstanbul Tıp Fakültesi,  
İstanbul Üniversitesi,  
İstanbul

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özlem Hesapçı (üye)  
İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi,  
İşletme Bölümü, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi,  
İstanbul

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ekin Eremsoy (üye)  
Psikoloji Bölümü, Doğu Üniversitesi,  
İstanbul

APPENDIX C

PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM (TURKISH)

1.Cinsiyetiniz

Kadın  Erkek

2.Yaşınız

21-25  26-30  31-35  36-40  41-45  46-50  51 ve üzeri

3. Mesleki kıdeminiz (yıl)

1-5 yıl  6-10 yıl  11- 15 yıl  16-20 yıl

4. Mezun olduğunuz eğitim kurumu:

Eğitim Fakültesi  Teknik Eğitim Fakültesi  Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi  
 Diğer ( Lütfen belirtiniz)

.....

5. Eğitim düzeyiniz

Ön lisans  Lisans  Yüksek Lisans  Doktora

APPENDIX D

PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM (ENGLISH)

1. Gender

Female       Male

2. Age

21-25     26-30     31-35     36-40     41-45     46-50     Above 51

3. Teaching experience (in years)

1-5 years       6-10 years       11- 15 years       16-20 years

4. Educational Institution You Graduated From:

Faculty of Education       Technical Faculty of Education

Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Other (Please identify) .....

5. Your Educational Degree

Associate Degree     Undergraduate       Masters       Doctorate

## APPENDIX E

## DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDE SCALE (TURKISH)

<b>Anketin bu bölümü 50 madde içermektedir. Bu maddeler, öğretmenlerin çeşitli konulardaki görüşleri ile ilgili genel bilgi toplamak amacıyla düzenlenmiştir. Bilimsel çalışmanın geçerliliği açısından, lütfen bütün ifadeleri okuyunuz ve doğru ya da yanlış olarak değerlendirmeden; her maddedeki ifadeye katılıp katılmadığınız, uygun olan kutuya çarpı işareti koyarak belirtiniz.</b>	Katılıyorum	Katılmıyorum
1. İnsanların amaçlarına saygılı olma, demokratik bir insanın en temel özelliğidir.		
2. Öğrenciler okulda yarışma içinde olmalıdırlar. Çünkü ileriki yaşamlarında yarışma içinde olacaklardır.		
3. Öğrenciler sınıf gösterileri ya da diğer grup etkinliklerine katılmaya teşvik edilmeli, ancak zorlanmamalıdır.		
4. Öğrencilerin ihtiyaç duymaları halinde sınıfı terk etmek için öğretmenden izin almaları gerekir.		
5. Öğrenciler sevmedikleri öğretmenlerin dersini almaya zorlanmamalıdır.		
6. Demokratikleşme sürecindeki gelişme bilimdeki gelişmeden daha önemlidir.		
7. Öğrenciler okul kantinini işletemeyecek kadar genç ve deneyimsizdirler.		
8. Öğrencileri demokrasi uygulamaları için yüreklendirmek öğretmenlerin en yüce görevidir.		
9. Gençlerin suç davranışlarının sıklığının ve ciddiyetinin artması, onların çok fazla özgür bırakılmalarının sonucudur.		
10. Sınavların türleri ve zamanları öğretmenlerin kararlarıyla belirlenmelidir.		
11. Sınıf düzeni ve disiplini, ilkokulun ilk yıllarından başlayarak, olabildiği kadar hızlı bir şekilde öğretmenlerin sorumluluğundan alınıp, öğrencilerin sorumluluğuna verilmelidir.		
12. Öğrenci, öğretmenin otoritesini ya da düşüncesini sorgulamaya başladığında, yani kendisi için düşünmeye başladığında demokrasi işliyor demektir.		
13. Türkiye’de eğitimcilerin zihnini kurcalayan sorunları kökünden ve uzmanca çözmeye çalışacak tam gün hizmet veren eğitim araştırmacıları olmalıdır.		
14. Öğretmenin sıkı denetimi altında bulunan öğrenciler kölelerden farklı değildirler.		

15. Çocuklara her denileni yapmak değil, düşünerek dürüstçe davranmak öğretilmelidir.		
16. Okul yönetiminin aldığı kararları değiştirmede öğrencilerin etkisi olmalıdır.		
17. Bir çocuğun mutlu olmayı öğrenmesi, okumayı öğrenmesinden daha önemlidir.		
18. Günümüzde kullanılan “geleneksel öğretim yöntemlerinin” yerini “çağdaş öğretim yöntemlerinin” alması için bilimsel araştırmaların yapılması ihmal edilmiştir.		
19. Amaçları başkaları tarafından belirlenen bir insan köledir.		
20. Genci kendi değer yargılarıyla uyuşmayan şeyleri yapmaya zorlamak son derece yanlıştır.		
21. Öğrencilerin öğretmenlere karşı tutumlarının araştırmalarla belirlenmesi gerekir.		
22. Eğitim politikaları belirleme konusunda, öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşüne gerek duyulmadan karar alma uygulaması sürdürülmelidir.		
23. Bir eğitim etkinliğinin değeri, öğrencilerin değerler sistemi açısından ölçülmelidir.		
24. Öğrencilerin beğenileri, sınıflara ve koridorlara asılacak tablo ve resimlerin seçimini yapabilecek kadar gelişmemiştir.		
25. Duyguların eğitimi, düşüncelerin gelişimi kadar önemlidir.		
26. “Zorunlu” sorumluluk, gerçek sorumluluk değildir.		
27. Öğrencilerin okulda sakız çiğnemelerine izin verilmemelidir.		
28. Öğrencilerin 10’da 9’unun karşı olduğu herhangi bir okul kuralı değiştirilmelidir.		
29. Ev ödevlerinin belirlenmesi, öğrencilerin kararına bırakılmamalıdır, bu ancak öğretmenler kurulunun karar yetkisinde olmalıdır.		
30. Bireysel özgürlük, ancak gerekli olduğunda grubun ilerlemesine engel olduğu durumlarda, bireyin onayı alınmadan başkaları tarafından sınırlandırılabilir.		
31. Çocuğun ilgilerinden çok ihtiyaçlarının dikkate alınması, tüm eğitim kurumlarının benimsediği ilke olmalıdır.		
32. Demokrasi, otokrat öğretmenler yerine görüşleri özgürce eleştirebilen, hiçbir zaman zorlayıcı olmayan uzman öğretmenler olduğu takdirde arttırılabilir.		
33. Bireylerin amacının kutsallığı, demokrasinin özü olarak vurgulanabilir.		
34. Demokratik bir okulda okul müdürüne gerek yoktur. Okul yaşamıyla ilgili kararlar öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin katılımıyla alınmalıdır.		
35. Öğrencilerin az bildikleri ya da hiç bilmedikleri konularla ilgili görüşlerini söylemelerine izin verilmemelidir.		
36. İdeal demokrasi herkese amaçlarını gerçekleştirme hakkı verir.		

37. Okulun, öğretmenler tarafından belirlenmiş kesin kuralları olmalıdır.		
38. Gerçekten demokratik olan öğretmenlerin, eğer özgürlük için gerekliyse, sınıfta bir miktar düzensizliği hoş görmeleri ve buna izin vermeleri gerekir.		
39. En iyi öğretmenler, sınıf atmosferi ile değil, öğretim konusu ile ilgilenirler.		
40. Ciddi davranış bozuklukları, öğrencilerin yönetim katılmalarına izin verildiği okullarda görülür.		
41. Öğretim programlarına sıkı bağlılık, sınıftaki demokratik yaşamın en büyük düşmanıdır.		
42. Uygulanamayan demokrasi öğrenilemez.		
43. Demokratik yöntemle kazanılan bilgiler kalıcı ve gerçek bilgilerdir.		
44. Okulun yakınında bir dükkanda çıkan yangın konusuna, verilecek ders konusundan daha çok zaman ayrılmalıdır.		
45. Öğrencilerin sınıfta oturacakları yeri kendilerinin seçmelerine izin verilmelidir.		
46. Sınıfta yapılan oylamalarda öğrencilerin kapalı oy hakkı olmalıdır.		
47. Öğretmenlerin, öğrencilerin amaçlarına saygı göstermeleri, çocukların da büyüklerine saygı göstermelerine neden olur.		
48. Çocukları özgür olan bir ulus, özgür insanları olan bir ulus olacaktır.		
49. “İyi niyetli despot bir öğretmen” “tam ve kontrolsüz özgürlük tanıyan öğretmenden” daha iyidir.		
50. Sağlıklı, demokratik toplumda gençler için yarışmalı oyunlar ve sporlar önemlidir.		

APPENDIX F

DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDE SCALE (ENGLISH)

<p><b>This part of the survey consists of 50 items. These items were designed to gather teachers' opinions on a number of different topics. In order to ensure the study's validity, please read all the statements and regardless of whether you consider the statements correct or not, please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the statement by ticking the appropriate box.</b></p>	<p><b>Agree</b></p>	<p><b>Disagree</b></p>
<p>1. Respecting other people's objectives is the main characteristic of a democratic person.</p>		
<p>2. Students should be in a competition at school because they will be in competition with others in their future lives.</p>		
<p>3. Students should be encouraged to participate in school performances and other group activities but they should not be forced to do so.</p>		
<p>4. Students need to get teachers' permission if they need to leave the classroom.</p>		
<p>5. Students should not be forced to take the courses of teachers they do not like.</p>		
<p>6. Progress in democratization process is more important than progress in science.</p>		
<p>7. Students are too young and inexperienced to run the school canteen.</p>		
<p>8. Teachers' most noble duty is to encourage the students for democratic practices.</p>		
<p>9. The frequency and seriousness of youth delinquency increases because they are given too much freedom.</p>		
<p>10. The types and times of exams should be determined by the teachers.</p>		
<p>11. Starting from the first years primary school, the responsibility for classroom management and discipline should be taken teachers and given to students.</p>		

<b>12.</b> When students start to question teachers' authority of opinions, in other words when they try to think for themselves, it means that democracy is working.		
<b>13.</b> There needs to be educational researchers in Turkey that work full time to help educationalists solve their educational problems expertly in a definitive manner.		
<b>14.</b> Students who are under tight control of teachers are no different than slaves.		
<b>15.</b> Children should be taught to behave honestly and act after reflection rather than doing everything they are told to do.		
<b>16.</b> Students should have a say in order to influence the decisions taken by school administration.		
<b>17.</b> It is more important for a child to learn to be happy than learning to read.		
<b>18.</b> Scientific research to replace 'traditional teaching methods' with 'modern teaching methods' has been ignored.		
<b>19.</b> A person whose goals are determined by others is a slave.		
<b>20.</b> It is definitively wrong to force a young person to do things that are against his/her values.		
<b>21.</b> Students' attitudes towards teachers should be identified by research studies.		
<b>22.</b> The practice of determining educational policies without taking students' and teachers' opinions into consideration should continue.		
<b>23.</b> The value of an educational activity should be evaluated based the students' value systems.		
<b>24.</b> Students' ability to judge what they like is not developed enough to choose what paintings and pictures are hung on the walls of classrooms and corridors.		
<b>25.</b> Education of emotions is as important as the development of thoughts.		
<b>26.</b> 'Compulsory' responsibility is not real responsibility.		
<b>27.</b> Students should not be allowed to chew gum at school.		
<b>28.</b> Any school rule opposed by 9 out of 10 students should be changed.		

<b>29.</b> Determining homework should not be left to student decisions; this can only be decided by a committee of teachers.		
<b>30.</b> Individual freedom should be curbed by others without the consent of the individual only when it is necessary and prevents the progress of the group.		
<b>31.</b> All educational institutions should have the principle of prioritizing student needs rather than student interests.		
<b>32.</b> Democracy can be enhanced with expert teachers who are never coercing and are open to free criticism of ideas instead of authoritarian teachers.		
<b>33.</b> The sacredness of an individual's goals is the essence of democracy.		
<b>34.</b> There is no need for a school principal at a democratic school. Decisions regarding school life should be made with the participation of students and teachers..		
<b>35.</b> Students should not be allowed to express their opinions on topics they know very little or nothing about.		
<b>36.</b> An ideal democracy should give everyone the right to actualize their goals.		
<b>37.</b> A school should have strict rules determined by teachers.		
<b>38.</b> Really democratic teachers should tolerate and allow a certain degree of disorganized behavior in the classroom if this is necessary for freedom		
<b>39.</b> Best teachers are concerned with teaching not the classroom atmosphere.		
<b>40.</b> Serious behavioral disorders are observed in schools where students are allowed to participate in school administration.		
<b>41.</b> Strict adherence to educational programs is the biggest enemy of democratic life in the classroom.		
<b>42.</b> If democracy is not applied, it cannot be learned.		
<b>43.</b> Knowledge gained through democratic methods is permanent and real knowledge.		
<b>44.</b> A fire at a store near the school should be given more time to discuss than a course subject.		
<b>45.</b> Students should be allowed to choose where to sit in the classroom.		

<b>46.</b> Students should be allowed to cast a secret ballot in elections in the classroom.		
<b>47.</b> If teachers respect students' goals, children then respect adults.		
<b>48.</b> A nation with free children will be a national with free people..		
<b>49.</b> "A well-meaning authoritarian teacher" is better than "a teacher that gives students full, uncontrolled freedom".		
<b>50.</b> Competitive games and sports are important for the youth in healthy, democratic societies.		

APPENDIX G

SAMPLE SELECTION LIST

Table 6. Sample Selection List

NO	Gender	Age (year)	Experience (year)	Educational Background	Academic Degree	Scale's Point
1	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other*	Associate	28.00
2	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	29.00
3	Female	46-50	26-30	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	29.00
4	Female	36-40	16-20	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	29.17
5	Female	41-45	21-25	Other	Associate	31.00
6	Male	41-45	21-25	Other	Associate	32.00
7	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	32.00
8	Female	41-45	16-20	Faculty of Engineering	Bachelor	33.69
9	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	33.69
10	Female	46-50	21-25	Other	Associate	34.00
11	Male	51 and over	26-30	Other	Associate	35.00
12	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	35.00
13	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	35.00
14	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	35.00
15	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	35.00
16	Female	51 and over	26-30	Other	Associate	35.00
17	Female	41-45	16-20	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Bachelor	35.10
18	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	35.71
19	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	36.00

NO	Gender	Age (year)	Experience (year)	Educational Background	Academic Degree	Scale's Point
20	Male	46-50	26-30	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	36.00
21	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	36.00
22	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	36.00
23	Female	46-50	26-30	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	36.00
24	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	36.73
25	Female	41-45	16-20	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Bachelor	37.00
26	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	37.00
27	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	37.00
28	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	37.00
29	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	37.50
30	Female	46-50	21-25	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	38.00
31	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	38.00
32	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	38.00
33	Female	46-50	31 and over	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	38.00
34	Male	41-45	21-25	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	38.00
35	Female	41-45	21-25	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	38.00
36	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	38.77
37	Male	51 and over	26-30	Other	Associate	39.00
38	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	39.00
39	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	39.00
40	Female	41-45	21-25	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	39.00
41	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	39.00

NO	Gender	Age (year)	Experience (year)	Educational Background	Academic Degree	Scale's Point
42	Female	41-45	16-20	Faculty of Engineering	Bachelor	39.00
43	Female	41-45	16-20	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	39.00
44	Male	51 and over	21-25	Other	Associate	39.58
45	Female	36-40	11-15 years	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Bachelor	39.63
46	Female	46-50	26-30	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	39.79
47	Female	46-50	11-15 years	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Bachelor	40.00
48	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	40.00
49	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	40.00
50	Female	46-50	26-30	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	40.00
51	Female	51 and over	26-30	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	40.00
52	Female	36-40	6-10 years	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	40.00
NO	Gender	Age (year)	Experience (year)	Educational Background	Academic Degree	Scale's Point
53	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	40.90
54	Female	46-50	26-30	Other	Associate	41.00
55	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	41.00
56	Male	46-50	26-30	Other	Associate	41.00
57	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	41.00
58	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	41.00
59	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Other	Associate	42.00
60	Female	41-45	16-20	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Bachelor	42.68
61	Female	46-50	16-20	Faculty of Education	Master	44.00
62	Female	46-50	26-30	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	44.18

\* Other (Educational Institute, Teacher College, School of Education)

APPENDIX H

PROFILE OF HIGH POINT'S PARTICIPANTS INITIALLY SELECTED

Table 7. Characteristics of High Point's Participants Initially Selected

Selected Teachers	Gender	Age (year)	Amount of teaching experience (year)	Educational Background	Academic Degree	The Democratic Attitude Scale's Point
Ayşe	Female	46-50	26-30	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	44.18
Elif	Female	46-50	16-20	Faculty of Education	Master	44.00
Fidan	Female	41-45	16-20	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Bachelor	42.68
Aliye	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Educational Institute	Associate	42.00
Kadriye	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Educational Institute	Associate	41.00
Nermin	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Educational Institute	Associate	41.00
Ali	Male	46-50	26-30	School of Education	Associate	41.00
Cemil	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Educational Institute	Associate	41.00
Filiz	Female	46-50	26-30	Faculty of Education	Associate	41.00
Kardelen	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Educational Institute	Associate	40.90
Nurcan	Female	36-40	6-10	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	40.00
Meral	Female	51 and over	26-30	Educational Institute	Associate	40.00
Aysun	Female	46-50	26-30	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	40.00
Hüseyin	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Educational Institute	Associate	40.00
Hakan	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Educational Institute	Associate	40.00
Mehtap	Female	46-50	16-20	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	Bachelor	40.00

APPENDIX I

PROFILE OF LOW POINT'S PARTICIPANTS INITIALLY SELECTED

Table 8.Characteristics of Low Point’s Participants Initially Selected

Selected Teachers	Gender	Age (year)	Amount of teaching experience (year)	Educational Background	Academic Degree	The Democratic Attitude Scale's Point
Turgut	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Teacher School	Associate	35.00
Seda	Female	46-50	21-25	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	34.00
Murat	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Teacher School	Associate	33.69
Betül	Female	41-45	16-20	Faculty of Engineering	Bachelor	33.69
Esra	Female	63	31 and over	Teacher School	Associate	32.00
Kemal	Male	41-45	21-25	School of Education	Associate	32.00
Melike	Female	41-45	21-25	School of Education	Associate	31.00
Zeliha	Female	36-40	16-20	Faculty of Education	Bachelor	29.17
Funda	Female	46-50	21-25	School of Education	Associate	29.00
Münire	Female	51 and over	31 and over	Teacher School	Associate	28.00
Ahmet	Male	51 and over	31 and over	Teacher School	Associate	28.00

## APPENDIX J

### INTERVIEW FORMS (TURKISH)

Bu görüşme öğretmen tutumları üzerine yürütülen yüksek lisans tez çalışması kapsamında yapılmaktadır. Elde edilecek bilgiler başka herhangi bir amaçla kullanılmayacaktır. Çalışmaya katılan öğretmenlerin bilgileri gizli kalacak, kişisel herhangi bir bilgi kullanılmayacaktır. Görüşmenin yaklaşık bir - bir buçuk saat sürmesi planlanmaktadır.

1. Öğretmenliğe başladığınız ilk zamanları anlatır mısınız? Neler yaşadınız, ne gibi zorluklarla karşılaştınız?
2. Öğretmenliğe başlamadan önce meslekle ilgili düşüncelerinizle, başladıktan sonra düşünceleriniz arasında bir fark oluştu mu? Hangi konularda beklentilerinizden farklılıklar söz konusuydu?
3. Öğretmenliğe başladığınız günden bu yana hangi tutumlarınızda değişimler olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?
4. Öğretmenliğe başladığınızdan bugüne öğrencilerinize yönelik tutum ve davranışlarınızda bir değişiklik oldu mu? Olduysa nasıl bir değişiklik oldu? Somut örnek(ler) verir misiniz?

Okul Yöneticisi hakkında

5. Okul müdürünün ya da okul yönetiminin görüş ve önerilerinin meslekle ilgili tutumlarınızı etkilediğini düşünüyor musunuz? Oldu ise bu hangi yönde olmuştur sizce, somut örnekler verebilir misiniz?
6. Öğrencilerle ilişkilerinizde, onlara yönelik tutum ve davranışlarınızda özel olarak okul müdürünün ya da yönetiminin etkili olduğu durumlar oldu mu? Somut örnek verebilir misiniz?

Meslektaşlar hakkında

7. Meslektaşlarınızın görüş ve önerilerinin meslekle ilgili tutumlarınızı etkilediğini düşünüyor musunuz? Oldu ise bu hangi yönde olmuştur sizce, somut örnek(ler) verebilir misiniz?

8. Öğrencilerle ilişkilerinizde, onlara yönelik tutum ve davranışlarınızda özel olarak meslektaşlarınızın etkili olduğu durumlar oldu mu? Somut örnek verebilir misiniz?

Öğrenciler hakkında

9. Sınıfınızda otoriteyi sağlamak, disiplini oluşturmak, kuralları koymak için nasıl bir yöntem izlersiniz? Öğrencilerinizi sürece dahil eder misiniz? Neden?
10. Mesleğe başladığınızdan bu yana öğrencilerinizle ilişkilerinizde onlara yönelik tutum ve davranışlarınızda bir değişiklik oldu mu? Olduysa neden ve nasıl bir değişiklik oldu? Somut örnek verebilir misiniz?

Veliler hakkında

11. Öğrenci velilerinizin mesleğinize yönelik görüş ve önerileri oluyor mu? Bugüne kadar size etkileyen bir durumla karşılaştınız mı bu konuda? Karşılaştıysanız somut örnek verir misiniz?
12. Öğrenci velilerinin özellikle öğrencilere yönelik tutum ve davranışlarınızda yönlendirici bir tavrı ile karşılaştınız mı? Somut örnek verir misiniz? Böyle bir durumla karşılaşıncı tavrınız ne oldu?
13. Ekleme istediğiniz bir şey var mı? Hakkında konuşmadığımız ama anlatsam iyi olur dediğiniz herhangi bir şey var mı?

## APPENDIX K

### INTERVIEW FORMS (ENGLISH)

#### The Interview Guide

This interview is conducted as part of the Master's research on teacher attitudes. The information collected will not be used for any other purpose. The information regarding the teachers that participate in the research will be kept confidential and no personal information will be made public. The interview is expected to take one to one and a half hours.

1. Can you talk about first years as a teacher? What did you experience? What sort of difficulties did you experience?
2. Is there a difference between your opinions about teaching as a profession before you started teacher and after you started it? What was different from what you had expected?
3. Which of your attitudes have changed since your first started teaching?
4. Have your attitudes and behaviors towards your students changed since you started teaching? If so, what changed have happened? Can you give concrete examples?

#### About school administrators

5. Do you think the ideas and suggestions of the school principal or administration influence your attitudes towards teaching? If yes, what sort of an influence was this? Can you give concrete examples?
6. Have here been any situations where the school principal or administration has been influential on your attitude and behaviors towards students? Can you give concrete examples?

#### About colleagues

7. Do you think the ideas and suggestions of your teacher colleagues influence your attitudes towards teaching? If yes, what sort of an influence was this? Can you give concrete examples?

8. Have there been any situations where your colleagues have been influential on your attitude and behaviors towards students? Can you give concrete examples?

#### About Students

9. What sort of a method do you use in order to establish order in your classroom and establish rules? Do you ensure student participation in the process? Why?
10. Have your attitudes and behaviors towards your students changed since you started teaching? If so, what changes have happened? Can you give concrete examples?

#### About Parents

11. Do parents have their ideas and suggestions on your profession? Have there been any situations that affected your teaching? If yes, can you give concrete examples?
12. Have there been any parents who tried to guide your attitudes and behaviors towards students? Can you give concrete examples? How did you behave in such a situation?
13. Is there anything you would like to add? Is there anything we didn't discuss but you would like to tell me about?

## APPENDIX L

### PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM (TURKISH)

Arařtırmacı:Rahřan Sönmez/ Boęaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi / Tel: .....

Sayın öğretmen,

Boęaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü'ne baęlı olarak "Okullardaki Enformal Öğrenme Deneyimleri Esnasında Öğretmenlerin Demokratik Tutum Geliřtirmesinde Etki Eden Faktörler" konulu tez çalışması yürütmekteyim.

Bu çalışmanın amacı söz konusu tutumların gelişmesinde okul ortamında hangi faktörlerin etkin olduğunu belirlemektir. Sizin bu çalışmaya katılımınız için İstanbul İl Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü ve İstanbul Valilięi'nden onay alınmıştır. Ayrıca okul yönetimi de bu konuda bilgilendirilmiştir.

Bu arařtırmaya katılmayı kabul ettięiniz takdirde size yönelteceęim soruları cevaplamanızı isteyeceęim. Görüşmenin yaklaşık bir- bir buçuk saat sürmesi planlanmaktadır. Görüşme ses kayıt cihazı ile kaydedilecektir.

Bu arařtırma bilimsel bir amaçla yapılmaktadır ve katılımcı bilgilerinin gizlilięi esas tutulmaktadır.Kayıt esnasında başka bir isim kullanılacaktır.Ses kaydı arařtırmacı dışında kimse tarafından kullanılmayacak, arařtırma sona erdięinde silinecektir.

Bu arařtırmaya katılmak tamamen isteęe baęlıdır.Katıldığınız takdirde çalışmanın herhangi bir aşamasında herhangi bir sebep göstermeden onayınızı çekme hakkına da sahipsiniz.Arařtırma projesi hakkında ek bilgi almak istedięiniz takdirde lütfen Boęaziçi Üniversitesi Öğretim Üyesi Yrd.Doç.Dr. Ayşe H. Caner ile temasa geçiniz. (Telefon: 0212 359 45 58, Adres: Boęaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, 34342 Bebek, İstanbul).

Eęer bu arařtırma projesine katılmayı kabul ediyorsanız, lütfen ařaęıdaki formu imzalayınız.

Bana anlatılanları ve yukarıda yazılanları anladım. Bu formun bir kopyasını aldım. Çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Katılımcı Adı-Soyadı :  
İmzası :  
Tarih (gün/ay/yıl) :

## APPENDIX M

### PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM (ENGLISH)

Researcher: Rahşan Sönmez/ Boğaziçi University Social Sciences Institute  
Educational Sciences Master's Student/ Phone number:.....

Dear Teacher,

Within the Boğaziçi University Social Sciences Institute, I conduct a Master's research study entitled "The factors that influence teachers' development of democratic attitudes during their informal learning experiences at schools".

This study aims to identify which factors in school settings are influential in the development of democratic attitudes. The permission of Istanbul Province Ministry of National Education and Istanbul Governorate has been taken for your participation in this study. Furthermore, the school administration has been informed of the research and your participation in it.

I will ask you answer the questions I present you with if you agree participate in this research. The interview is expected to take one to one and a half hours. The interview will be tape-recorded.

This research is being conducted with a scientific purpose and confidentiality of participant information is paramount. During the recording, a different name will be used. The recording will not be used by anyone other than the researcher and will be deleted at the end of the research.

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. If you decide to participate, you can withdraw your consent at any point without giving any reasons. If you need further information about the research, please contact Yrd. Doç.Dr. Ayşe H. Caner at Boğaziçi University Caner. (Telephone: 0212 359 45 58, Address: Boğaziçi University Faculty of Education, 34342 Bebek, İstanbul).

If you agree to participate in this research project, please sign below.

I understood what was explained to me and what is written above. I was given a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this research study.

Participant Name and Surname :  
Signature :  
Date (Day/Month/Year) :

APPENDIX N  
NARRATIVES IN TURKISH

<sup>1</sup> İdareciler okul iyi olsun bununla uğraşıyorlar... İşin içinde olmuyorlar, 15-20 sene öğretmenlik yapıp gelse neyse, genelde 3-4 sene öğretmenlik yapıp idareci oluyorlar... Daha yönetim esaslı hareket ediyorlar. (Filiz)

<sup>2</sup> Kafanızın rahat olması önemli. Okula istemeyerek geliyorsanız başarı olmuyor.İdareci ile atıştım bir dönem.Hiç istemeden geliyordum okula, idareci benden özür diledi.Öğretmen rahat olmalı.Öğrenciyi de harcıyordum o zaman.Çok sinirliydim. (Filiz)

<sup>3</sup> Şimdi eğer çok baskıcı bir tutum sergiliyorsa idareci üzerimde o baskıyı hissediyorum ve sınıfta daha tedirgin oluyorum. Her an ne zaman gelecek şimdi gelip ne söyleyecek gibi böyle bir tutum içerisine giriyorum ve bu beni rahatsız ediyor. Ve huzurlu olamıyorum o zaman. Huzurlu olamayınca da rahat eğitim veremiyorum. Ama mesela şu anda idarecimiz oldukça saygılı hepimize güveniyor, o yüzden rahatım hiç huzursuz değilim. Huzursuz olmadığım için de görevimi gayet güzel yerine getiriyorum... Benim tek isteğim bu baskıcı tutum olmasın. Niye geç kaldın, niye öyle oldu? Ya zaten bir problem yoksa geç kalmamıştır bir insan. (Nurcan)

<sup>4</sup> Okul idarecilerinin öğretmene karşı davranışları çok önemli... Hani en ufak şeye öğretmeni eleştiriyor ya da ne bileyim kızabiliyor da. Yani öğretmen sınıfa morali bozuk girdiği an verimi düşer zaten. Beni olumsuz etkileyen ufak tefek olaylar olmuştur önceki yıllarda... Mesela en basiti işte ders zili çaldı girmediğin anda iki dakika geçince zil çaldı neredesin niye girmedin? Hani böyle bazen oluyordu. (Funda)

<sup>5</sup> Bir tane bayan müdür muavinimiz vardı. Ben o zamanlar mesleğimin daha 12-13.yılındayım. Ortaokul öğrencileri jöleli saçlarla gelmişler.Saçlarını erkek gibi kestirmiş üçü-kız öğrenciler-, jölelemişler saçlarını.Bir öğretmen arkadaş ben idarecinin yanında otururken çocukları getirdi.Müdür yardımcısı ‘ne güzel olmuş saçların, hep böyle olsun’ dedi. O çocukları getiren öğretmen çok bozuldu. Okul müdürümüz topladı bütün öğretmenleri, bu davranışların normal olduğunu çocuklarda gelip geçici ergenlikler bulunduğunu, bunlara bizim hoşgörülü davranmamız gerektiğini anlattıktan sonra okuldaki ortam güzelleşti. İdareciliği ilk kez ben o arkadaşlarda gördüm. (Kemal)

<sup>6</sup> Bazı öğrenciler okul kıyafetini giymeden gelebiliyor. İdare diyor ki niye kıyafetini giymedin? Ya bir gün giymemiş ne çıkar? Bir öğretmen olarak ben hoş görüyorken, bir idareci buna göz yumamıyor... (Kemal)

<sup>7</sup> Öğretmenliğimin üçüncü yılında... bizzat müdür yetkili arkadaş bir çocuğun kulağını zarar vererek çekmişti. Orada şiddeti görmüştüm. (Kemal)

<sup>8</sup> ...işte şiddet uygulayan bir idareci varsa onların yaptığını düşünerek kendim yapmamamı ya da güzel davranışları mesela bir okul müdürü bir müdür yardımcısı hava soğuk montu önü açık bir öğrenciyi dışarı çıkarken uyarıyorsa, aa evet bunu ben de yapmalıyım diyorum... Sınıftan çıkarken öğrenciye montunu unutma, önün kapat demeyi öğreniyorsunuz. (Aysun)

<sup>9</sup> İlk stajyerliğimde, 40 yıllık bir öğretmenimiz vardı. O kadar çok şey var ki, sıkıntı yaşıyor, sorun yaşıyor falan, hiç unutmam o beni aldı karşısına dedi ki 'çocuklarla bir sürü şey yaşanacaktır, böyle şeyler olacaktır bir tek şey yap, çık dışarıya derin nefes al koridorda bir aşağı bir yukarı yürü onu atlat ondan sonra gir konuş ve onların yedi yaşında olduklarını sakın unutma.'... Arkadaşlarımızla konuşuruz, paylaşırız. Birbirimiz etkileriz tabii ki. (Ayşe)

<sup>10</sup> Olumlu olanlar da oldu, olumsuz davranışlarını görüp bunlar gibi olmamalıyım dediklerim de oldu. Bir öğrenci mesela, ekonomik durumu veya fiziki yapısıyla öğrenciyi değerlendiren insanlar, öğreten arkadaşlar da var, 'o zaten şöyle bir çocuk' deyip kenara atan... Ama kaynaştırma öğrencilerini bağrına basan onlara emek veren arkadaşlarımı gördükçe, kimse istemediyse 'o kaynaştırma öğrencisini ben alırım' dedim... Çok sert tutumlar da gördüm. Ancak öğretmen sınıftan çıktıktan sonra öğrencinin tavrının değiştiğini de gördüm. Demek ki sınıfta çok otoriter olmaya da gerek yokmuş. Çünkü baskı kuruyorsunuz, o baskı siz gittiğiniz zaman yok oluyor. Ortadan kayboluyor, o yüzden mesela davranışa kızabilirim, ama ödev yapmamışsınızdır neden yapmadın ya da bu yazı olmamış deyip çocuğu rencide etmem. Defterini falan yırtmam, ona şiddet uygulamam. (Aysun)

<sup>11</sup> Bizim bir öğretmen arkadaş vardı... Ondan çok olumlu güzel bir örnek gördüm ben. Ben genel olarak çocuklarca sert birisi olarak görülürüm, dobra dobra konuşarak anlaşırđık. Kalabalığın içinde anlaşmaya çalışırdık. Bağırarak sesimi duyurmaya çalışırdım. O arkadaş geldi bahçede olsun, sınıfında olsun davranışlarını gözlemlerdim. Çocuklara tıpkı kendi çocuğuyla veya kendi eşiyle, ona nasıl değer verdiğini, ses tonunu çok güzel ayarlayarak, yumuşak konuştuğunu gördüm. Çocuklarda olan değişimin de farkına vardım... Bu benim için örnek alınacak bir durum oldu. Sınıfta asla sesimi yükseltmeden çocuğun kalbinin kırılmayacağını düşünüyorum. Ondan aldığım çok ama çok etkileyici kazandığım bir değer olarak görüyorum. (Kemal)

<sup>12</sup> ... 16 -17 yıl önce falan. Bir öğretmen arkadaşım benim meslektaşım çocuğun bir tanesine tekme atmış, şiddet uygulamış.Çocuk yere yığılmış. O çocuğun o halini gördükten sonra bir daha çocuğa vurmadım. Bir daha çocuğa asla dokunmadım, şiddetin ne kadar yanlış ve nerelere gideceğini gördüm. (Kemal)

<sup>13</sup> Bir öğretmen arkadaşımın problemlili bir öğrencisi vardı... Sık sık o öğretmen arkadaşı o çocukla teneffüste konuşurlarken elini omuzuna atarak çocuğun yani büyük sevgi göstererek anlayışla konuştuğunu gördüm... Ve o çocuğun gelişmeler gösterdiğini de gördüm. Hani kendisine ilgi sevgi gösterilen bir problem olan öğrencilerin daha da ilerlediğini gördüm... Bu yönde bana çok katkısı olmuştur o öğretmenin. (Betül)

<sup>14</sup> Fikirler geliyor, konuşuyoruz onlarla –öğretmen arkadaşları-... Diyelim işte çocuğa kızdım mesela geçen gün gözümün önünde yırttı defterini sadece ‘nasıl böyle yazdın’ dedim... Bunu gelip anlatıyorum, paylaşıyorum –öğretmenler odasında. Arkadaşlar böyle yaptı nasıl yapayım ben bunu? Bir şey demedim o an arkadaşlarının içerisinde. Arkadaşlarım da rehber öğretmene gitmemi tavsiye ettiler. Ama ben önce kendim görüşmeyi daha çok yeğledim. Sonra çocuğu çağırıp ‘kızım niye böyle yaptın’ dedim. ‘O anda ben başka şeye kızmıştım’ dedi, siz de beni dedi dinlemeden kızdığımız için ben de defterimi yırttım’ dedi. ‘Birbirimizi dinleyelim, yaptığını bana karşı bir saygısızlık olarak algıladım’ dedim. Daha sonra rehber öğretmene gitti, aileden gelen psikolojik nedenleri olduğunu gördük. Sınıftaki iyi olan şeyleri de anlatıyorum kötü olan şeyleri de anlatıyorum. Çünkü anlattığım zaman farklı fikirler geliyor. O zaman en uygun olanı benimsiyorum o şekilde davranıyorum çocuğa veya konuşuyorum. (Meral)

<sup>15</sup> ... Öğrenci herhangi bir kurala uymadığı zaman, kapıdan dışarıya çıkarıyormuş. Sınıftan çıkıp, kapının dışında duruyor öğrenci. Bu bana ters yani. Bu olumsuz bir örnek ve hoş olmadı. (Fidan)

<sup>16</sup> Daha yüksek sesle konuşurdum ilk yıllar. Sonra baktım çocuklar da aynı tonla konuşuyor birbiri ile. Siz birine kızılıyorsunuz mesela bakılıyorsunuz bir süre sonra onlar da yapıyor... Şimdi daha duyulabilir bir sesle konuşuyorum.(Ayşe)

<sup>17</sup> Sizin karakterinizle, isteklerinizle, çocukların katılımıyla sınıftaki çocukların o özel durumları da dikkate alınarak sınıf kuralları oturuyor... Çocuklarla da kural oluşturmanın faydasına inanıyorum, çünkü onlar birbirlerini çok daha rahat kontrol ediyorlar, biz bunu önerdik ve biz bu davranışa uymuyoruz gibi... (Ayşe)

<sup>18</sup> Her davranışımı bir kere ölçerek, her konuşmamı ölçerek, düşünerek yapıyorum. Bunu öğrendim ve sabırlı olmayı öğrendim çocuklar karşısında. Empati kurmayı, daha fazla empati kurmaya başladım, çocuğun seviyesine indim. Onların gözünden bakmaya çalıştım... Önceden çocuktur deyip geçiyorsunuz fakat gerçekten dünyaları

çok farklı önemsemek gerekiyor hepsinin düşüncelerini... Çok şey kattı bana yani çocuklarla birlikte olmak. (Fidan)

<sup>19</sup> Ben pozitif disiplini daha çok göz önünde bulundurarak hareket ediyorum. Çocuklarla beraber kuralları belirlemeye çalışıyoruz. Çocuklar sürekli katıldıkları zaman, kendileri de bir parça bir şey katınca belirledikleri kurallara daha çok uyuyorlar. (Fidan)

<sup>20</sup> Sınıf yönetimi ile ilgili olsun, çocuklarla ilgili olsun onların dünyalarını tanımaya çalışıyorum... Mesela ilk başta çocuğu dinliyormuş gibi yapıp çok fazla net dinlemiyordum galiba... şimdi ama iyice dinliyorum, çocuk ne demek istiyor, onu iyice dinliyorum. Eğer dinlenemeyecek bir ortamsa 'bir dakika dur çocuğum seni sonra dinleyeceğim' diyorum. (Nurcan)

<sup>21</sup> Dönemin başında mutlaka sınıf kuralları ile ilgili bir çalışma yaparım. Bu kurallara çocukları da katarım... doğru davranışı beraber drama ile yaparız. Yanlış davranışı yaparız. Böyle olduğunda nasıl oldu, şöyle olduğunda nasıl oldu şeklinde. Veya slayttan kurallarla ilgili slaytlar izlettiririm onlara. Mutlaka kuralın parçası haline getirmeye çalışırım çocukları mutlaka. Çünkü onu benimsemesi için o kuralı beraber koymamız lazım. (Nurcan)

<sup>22</sup> Çocuğa sert davrandığınızda bakıyorsunuz çocuk içine sınıyor bildiğini de söyleyemiyor. Yavaş yavaş onu bırakıyorsunuz. İşte daha yakın davrandıkça çocuktaki verimi alıyorsunuz. Alınca demek ki böyle davranmalıyım ve bunu eşimle – eşi de öğretmen- evde konuşuyorduk, böyle yaptığım zaman çocuklardan daha iyi verim alıyorum. Böyle yapınca konuşunca çocuk daha iyi algıladı diyorum... (Meral)

<sup>23</sup> Birinci sınıftan itibaren okulun kuralları, işte sınıfın kuralları, sürekli kurallar, tahtaya öğrencilerle yazıyoruz... Resimlerle şu an benim sınıfımda var asılı kurallar... Ama ara ara böyle söylendikçe zamanı geldikçe zaten çocuk senin bakışından bile anlıyor ne yapması gerektiğini. (Meral)

<sup>24</sup> Çocuklarla öyle bir, bana öğretilen, 40 yılda kazandığım ders verme şeklim öyle bir tavırlarım var. Çocuklar gerçekten bağırımdan bile mutlu oluyorlar, bana güvenmiyorlar. Çocuklarla ilk sevgi köprüsünü çocuklarla ilk hafta atarım. O sevgi köprüsü ile başlar gider... ama atamadıklarım, ben de yapamıyorum. Gitmek zorunda çocuktan da kaynaklanıyor, benden de kaynaklanıyor. (Ahmet)

<sup>25</sup> Ben anne olduktan sonra değişti. O zaman çocukları daha iyi anlamaya başladım. İlk zamanlar belki daha çabuk kızabiliyordum. Daha sonra yıllar içinde anne olduktan sonra daha hoşgörülü oluyorsun yıllar içinde. Sonuçta şunu düşünüyorum ben, çocuğa yumuşak davranarak, daha saygılı olduğunu görmeye başlıyorsun... Ben

biraz sınıfta böyle çok kuralları oturtamıyorum. Böyle bir eksikliğim var ya da benden mi kaynaklı bazı arkadaşlarda şu var, mesela sınıfta olmasa bile sınıf mum gibi duruyor ama benim öyle sınıfım olmadı yani. (Funda)

<sup>26</sup> ... benim hani yöntemimde şöyle bir şey var arada sert böyle sıkı hani böyle sesimin yüksek olup çok ciddi anlamda sert olduğum zamanlar olur ama genelde sestonumu dikkati çekmek için yükseltirim bazen... Ben ilk başta bu şeyi yumuşak bir tavırla ama yeri geldiği zaman çok sert olabileceğimi ama bunu hani yapmanın gerekliliğini görmediğim için onların aslında sınıf kurallarını kendilerinin oluşturabileceği bilincini onlarda oluşturarak her zaman şey yaptım. (Zeliha)

<sup>27</sup> Çok sıkıntılı zamanlarımda, nöbet günleri ya da sıkıntılı durumlarda çocuklara bazen yanlış davranmış olabiliyorum. Benim o yanlışına çocuğa ve sınıfa böyle bir yanlışın insan olarak yapılabileceğini ancak öğretmenin daha dikkatli olması gerektiğini onu yapmamam gerektiği çocuktan özür dilemişimdir, gönlünü almışımdır. Ama yanlışım olmuştur, sert tavrım olmuştur, yanlış yöntem uygulamışımıdır. (Zeliha)

<sup>28</sup> Şiddeti bırakıyorsunuz. Şiddeti bıraktıkça bir orta yol bulmaya çalışıyorsunuz çocuklarla. Bu işi yapmak zorundasınız. Bu mesleği yapmak zorundasınız. Bu ortamın içerisinde nasıl yaparsınız? Bu sistemi nasıl kurarsınız. Düşün düşün bu şekilde ortaya çıkıyor... (Kemal)

<sup>29</sup> Çocukların kendi oto kontrol sistemi ile disiplinin sağlanabileceğini düşünüyorum... Nasıl olacak bir örnekle açıklayayım isterseniz. Sınıf ortamı içerisinde bir kere çocuklara kendi kişiliklerinin gelişmesi için yardımcı olunup onları kendi kişilikleri üzerinden değerlendirip, sınıf içerisinde konuşa konuşa anlata anlata birbirlerini değerlendirerek veya eleştirerek bu ortam içerisinde sağlamaya çalışacaklar. (Kemal)

<sup>30</sup> Tabii ki ilk yıllarda davranışlarım daha sertti. Hatta zaman zaman dayağı bile kullanıyordum köylerde. İşte aile geliyordu aile görüşüyordunuz ya böyle böyle bir durum var 'e vursana' diyordu... Kendi öğretmenlerimiz de bizi çok dövmüştü. Hatta alışkanlık yapmıştı... sosyal kültürümüz geliştikçe mesleki kitaplarla haşır neşir oldukça bunu terk ettik... Ben sonradan şunu gördüm yani öğrencilere baskıcı davranmak hakaret etmek bir manada bizim kendimize hakaret etmemiz... ha şunu söylemek isterim bazen öğrenciyi tecrit yönetim kullanıyordum fakat bunun doğru bir davranış olmadığını gördük (dışarı çıkarma). (Murat)

<sup>31</sup> Benim mesleğimin üzerinde bana bir yaptırım gücü yok dolayısıyla beni yönlendiremez. Mesleki ilkelerimi koyarım, sınırını çizerim velinin. Veli sınıfıma karışamaz akademik boyutuyla. Yani böylesi bir şey içi ilişkiye sokmam. (Elif)

<sup>32</sup> ... sadece kendi bildiklerim doğrularım değil de çevrenin de beklentileri (veli-öğrenci) benim de beklentilerim üzerine bir öğretmen profili çizmeye çalıştım. (Elif)

<sup>33</sup> Velilerin öğretmenliğe yönelik bilgisi bilimsel bir içeriğe sahip değil. Bu okulda da daha önceki çalıştığımız okullarda da veli böyle bir öneri getirecek durumda değil. Okur yazarlık açısından. (Murat)

<sup>34</sup> Bazı velilerimden, öğretmen velilerimden mesleki kitaplar aldım, öğretmenler gününde kitap armağanları. (Murat)

<sup>35</sup> Veliye yağ çekersen öğrenciyi pohpohlarsan öğrenciye hiçbir şey vermeden ‘sen aslansın sen süpersin’ ki burada çok kullanılır, sen harika öğretmensindir... Öğretmen veliye demek istediğini değil de velinin duymak istediğini söylediği için çocuklar böyle oluyor... Velilere yumuşak davranamıyorum. Dobra dobra hatalarımı yüzlerine diyorum. Çocuklarının bütün özelliklerini yüzlerine söylüyorum... Öğrenci seçerken bana tüm kapıcı çocukları verildi. Ben de idareye gittim niye bu listeleri böyle yaptınız dedim... bana dedikleri şu, ‘senin öğretmen arkadaşların bunu yaptılar biz değil. Veli onun için ne anlatmışlarsa sizden çekindi veremedi’... Evet sertim, çocuğu başarıya şey yaparım... (Ahmet)

<sup>36</sup> Şimdi şöyle mesela bir konuyu anlattığım zaman daha detaylı anlatmak istiyorum. Hepsinin anlaması için uğraşıyorum. Hani o zaman o kadar bende yoktu. Geçerdim, o bil inç bende yoktu o kadar. Bu yıllar içinde gelişti. Bir de tabii çalıştığım ortamdan dolayı da böyle. Velinin senden beklentisi de farklı oluyor. Kırsal yerde o kadar olmayabilir. Çünkü veli o kadar çocuğun üzerinde durmuyor. Ama burada öyle değil. Velinin beklentisi var, okulu araştırmış gelmiş, senden farklı şeyler bekliyor. O nedenle o istemeden bir şekilde gelişiyor. (Funda)

<sup>37</sup> ...Bizim genelde toplum olarak böyle mesela ne bileyim biri doktordur, mesela televizyona çıkar mesleği ile ilgili olmayan konularda yorum yapar. Böyle sanki bir şeyleri fazla biliyoruz gibi mi şey yapıyoruz, herşeyden bilgimiz var. Eğitimimiz olmasa da illa ki görüş bildiriyoruz. Böyle yapan veliler mesela var. (Betül)

<sup>38</sup> Veli artık öğretmene hükmediyor. Yani bir yerde size yaptırım uyguladıkları için bu sefer çocuklara rehberlik ediyormuş gibi oluyorsunuz. Çünkü çocuğu derste azarladığınız zaman ‘acaba gidip beni müdür beye şikayet edecek mi?’ diye düşünüyorsunuz. Çünkü benim burada beşinci yılım ve ben dört yıl önce burada bunu çok yaşadım... Öğretmene tamamen hükmeden, evde çocuğa her türlü baskıyı uygulayıp da burada öğretmenin ‘çekil kızım’ demesine bile fırsat vermeyen veli grubuyla çalıştım. Şu anki veli grubum daha iyi çünkü bu çevreden değil... dar gelirli ailelerden gelen çocuklar. Henüz o aile kaygısı, büyüklere olan sevgi sürdüğü için öğretene karşı bu veli grubumu daha çok seviyorum. (Seda)

<sup>39</sup> ‘Arkadaşına bağırmadınız da niye ona bağırdınız?’ ‘Onun tuvalete gitmesine niye izin vermediniz?’... bunları yaşayınca çok kötü etkilendim. Huzursuz gidiyordum derse. Şimdi şey veliler bu tip şeyleri çok takip ediyorlar. Yani şöyle diyorlar, evdeki her şeyi bırak sadece benim çocuğumla ilgilen. Ama çocuk senin verdiği şeyi alabiliyor mu karşılığını verebiliyor mu bilmiyor.Öğretmeni daha çok yönlendirmeye çalışıyor, davranış olarak yönlendirmeye çalışıyor. (Seda)

<sup>40</sup> Mesela çocuğunun durumunu bana özellikle anlatan belirten olayı saklamayan veliler benim tutum ve davranışlarımı değiştirdi. Çocuğu görüyorsun, mesela çocuk sürekli uykulu geliyor. Soruyorsunuz ‘Uyuyamadın mı gece?’, ‘Uyuyamadım.’.Çocuğun altına kaçırma problemi var. Anne sürekli kaldırıyor yıkıyor bilmem ne yapıyor. Ya da evde bir yaşlı var. İşte bunları veli paylaştığı zaman siz de sorduğunuz zaman tabii ki davranışlar değişiyor öğrenciye karşı. (Aysun)

## REFERENCES

- Adalsteinsdottir, K. (2004). Teachers' behaviour and practices in the classroom. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 48(1), 95-113.
- Allen, K. P. (2010). Classroom management, bullying, and teacher practices. *The Professional Educator*, 34(1).
- Almog, O. & Shechtman, Z. (2007). Teachers' democratic and efficacy beliefs and styles of coping with behavioural problems of pupils with special needs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 22(2), 15-129.
- Arslan, M.C. (2012). *İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin demokratik tutum ve davranışlarının öğretmen motivasyonu ve öğrenci başarısına etkisi* (Unpublished MA thesis). Gaziantep University, Gaziantep, Turkey.
- Bartlett, L. (2008). Paulo Freire and peace education, *Encyclopedia of Peace Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.tc.edu/centers/epe/>
- Basu, S. J. & Barton, A.C. (2010). A researcher-student-teacher model for democratic science pedagogy: Connections to community, shared authority, and critical science agency. *Equity & Excellence Education*, 43(1), 72-87.
- Billett, S. (2001). Learning throughout working life: Interdependencies at work. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 23(1), 19-35.
- Billett, S. (2002). Workplace pedagogic practices: Co-participation and learning. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 50(4), 457-481.
- Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education, an introduction to theory and methods*. Pearson Education Group.
- Colley, H., Hodkinson, P. & Malcolm, J. (2003). Informality and formality in learning: A report for the Learning and Skills Research Centre. *Learning and Skills Research Centre*. University of Leeds.
- Collinson, V. & Cook, T. F. (2003). Learning to share, sharing to learn: Fostering organizational learning through teachers' dissemination of knowledge. *Paper for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, Chicago. Retrieved from the ERIC database.
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Çakmur, E. (2007). *İlköğretim okullarında çalışan öğretmenlerin sınıf-içi davranışlarının demokratiklik düzeyleri* (Unpublished MA thesis). Yeditepe University, Istanbul, Turkey.

- Dündar, H. (2013). Relationship between values owned by teacher candidates and their democratic attitudes. *International Journal of Social Science*, 6, 367-381.
- Ellström P.E. (2001). Integrating learning and work: Problems and prospects. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 4, 421-435.
- Eraut, M. (2004). Informal learning in the workplace. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26, 247-273.
- Eraut, M. (2007). Learning from other people in the workplace. *Oxford Review Education*, 33(4), 403-422.
- Eraut, M., Alderton, J., Cole, G. & Senker, P. (2000). Development of knowledge and skills at work. *The Necessity of Informal Learning*, 95, 1-3.
- Firestone, W.A. (1987). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. *Educational Researcher*, 16 (7), 16-21.
- Garrick, J. I. (1998). *Informal learning in the workplace: Unmasking human resource development*. London: Routledge.
- Gözütok, D. (1995). *Öğretmenlerin demokratik tutumları*. Ankara, Turkey: Ekin Matbaacılık ve Yayıncılık.
- Hayes, B., Hindle, S., & Withington, P. (2007). Strategies for developing positive behaviour management. Teacher Behaviour Outcomes and Attitudes to the Change Process. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 23(2), 161-175.
- Hodkinson, H. & Hodkinson P. (2005). Improving school teachers' workplace learning. *Research Paper in Education*, 20(2), 109-131.
- Hodkinson, P., Bieste, G. & James, D. (2008). Understanding learning culturally: Overcoming the dualism between social and individual views of learning. *Vocations and Learning*, 1(1), 27-47.
- Hoekstra, A., Korthagen, F. Brekelmans, M. Beijaard, D. & Imants, J. (2009). Experienced teachers' informal workplace learning and perceptions of workplace conditions. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 21(4), 276-298.
- İnceoğlu, M. (2010). *Tutum, Algı, İletişim*. Istanbul, Turkey: Beykent Üniversitesi Yayınevi.
- Jahan, S., Mahmud, A.S. & Papageorgiou, C. (2014). What Is Keynesian Economics? *Finance & Development*, 53-54.
- Jones, V. & Jones, L. (2013). *Comprehensive classroom management creating communities of support and solving problems*. Boston: Pearson.

- Jurasaitė-Harbison, E. (2009). Teachers' Workplace learning within informal contexts of school cultures in the United States and Lithuania. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 21(4), 299-321.
- Jurasaitė-Harbison, E. & Rex, L.A. (2010). School as contexts for informal teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 267-277.
- Kapıcı Zengin, U.(2003). *Öğretmenlerin öz-yeterlilik algıları ve sınıf içi iletişim örüntüleri* (Unpublished MA thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, Turkey.
- Karahan T.F., Sardoğan M. E., Özkamalı E. & Dicle A.N. (2006). Öğretmen adaylarında demokratik tutum, nevrotik eğilimler ve kendini gerçekleştirme. *H.Ü. Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30, 149-158.
- Kaya, C. (2013). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetimindeki demokratik tutumlarının incelenmesi* (Unpublished MA thesis). Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey.
- Kaya, Ş. (2012). *İlköğretim 1.kademe öğrenci velilerinin okuldan beklentileri ve beklentilerinin karşılama düzeyi* (Unpublished MA thesis). Yeditepe University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Lichtman, M. (2006). *Qualitative research in education a user's guide*. London: Sage.
- Livingstone D. W. (2001). Adults' informal learning: definitions, findings,gaps and future research. *NALL Working Paper*, 21, 1-49.
- Lohman, M.C. (2000). Environmental inhibitors to informal learning in the workplace: A case study of public school teachers. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 50(2), 83-101.
- Lohman, M.C. (2003). Work situations triggering participation in informal learning in the workplace: A case study of public school teachers. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 16(1), 40-54.
- Marsick, V. J. & Watkins, K. (1990). *Informal and incidental learning in the workplace*. London: Routledge.
- Mcnally J., Blake A. & Reid A. (2009). The Informal learning of new teachers in school. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 21(4), 322-333.
- Meirink, J.A., Meijer, P.C., Verloop, N. & Bergen, T.C.M. (2009). How do teachers learn in workplace? An examination of teacher learning activities. *European journal of Teacher Education*, 32(3), 209-224.
- Merriam, S.B. (2009). *Qualitative research, a guide design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Nir, A.E. & Kranot, N. (2006). School principal's leadership style and teachers' self-efficacy. *Planning and Changing*, 37(3-4), 205-218.
- Pace, J.L. & Hemmings, A. (2007). Understanding authority in classrooms: A review of theory, ideology, and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 4-27.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pellegrino, A. (2010). Pre-Service teachers and classroom authority. *American Secondary Education*, 38(3), 62-78.
- Pepper, C.F. & Henry, S.L. (1985). Using developmental and democratic practices to teach self-discipline. *Theory into Practice*, 24(4), 264-270.
- Price, H.E. (2012). Principal-teacher interactions: How affective relationships shape principal and teacher attitudes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(1), 39-85.
- Price, H.E. (2015). Principals' social interactions with teachers: How principal-teacher social relations correlate with teachers' perceptions of student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(1), 116-139.
- Ratcliff, N.J., Jones, C.R., Costner, R.H., Savage-Davis, E. & Hunt, G.H. (2010). The elephant in the classroom: The impact of misbehavior on classroom climate. *Education*, 131(2), 302-314.
- Skule, S. (2004). Learning conditions at work: A framework to understand and assess informal learning in the workplace. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 8(1), 8-20.
- Smaller, H. (2005). Teacher informal learning and teacher knowledge: Theory, practice and policy. *International Handbook of Educational Policy*, 1-26.
- Straka, G. A. (2004). Informal learning: genealogy, concepts, antagonisms and questions. *Institute Technology and Education*, 1-27.
- Telatar, S. (2012). *İlköğretim Okullarında Görev Yapan Öğretmenlerin Demokratik Tutumları ile Kişilik Özellikleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi (İstanbul İli Anadolu Yakası Örneği)* (Unpublished MA thesis). Yeditepe University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Tirri, K. & Puolimatka, T. (2000). Teacher authority in schools: A case study from Finland. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 26(2), 157-165.
- Üstün, G. (2011). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin yansıtıcı düşünme eğilimleri ile demokratik tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished MA thesis).

Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey.

- van Woerkom, M., Nijhof, W. J. & Nieuwenhuis, L. F. M. (2002). Critical reflective working behaviour: A survey research. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 26(8), 375-383
- Williams, A. (2003). Informal learning in the workplace: A case study of new teachers. *Educational Studies*, 29(2-3), 207 – 219.
- Yalçın, G. (2007). *Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetiminde gösterdikleri davranışların demokratikliğine ilişkin öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşleri (Malatya ili örneği)* (Unpublished MA thesis). İnönü University, Malatya, Turkey.
- Yariv, E. (2009). Students' attitudes on the boundaries of teachers' authority. *School Psychology International*, 30(1), 92-111.
- Zehir Topkaya, E., & Yavuz, A. (2011). Democratic values and teacher self-efficacy perceptions: A case of pre-service English language teachers in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(8), 32-49.